

Development of Gymnasia and Graeco- Roman Cityscapes

Ulrich Mania
Monika Trümper
(eds.)



edition | topoi

THE GYMNASIUM was one of the key monuments for the formation of urban space and identity in Greek culture, and its transformation was closely interlinked with changing concepts of cityscaping. Knowledge as well as transfer of knowledge, ideas and concepts were crucial for the spread and long-lasting importance of gymnasia within and beyond the Greek and Roman world.

The contributions investigate the relationship between gymnasia and cityscapes in the Hellenistic and Roman Imperial period as well as in the eastern and western Mediterranean, revealing chronological (dis)continuities and geographical (dis)similarities. The focus in the much-neglected west is on Sicily and South Italy (Akrai, Cuma, Herculaneum, Megara Hyblaea, Morgantina, Neaiton, Pompeii, Segesta, Syracuse), while many major sites with gymnasia from the entire eastern Mediterranean are included (Athens, Eretria, Olympia, Pergamon, Rhodes).

Central topics comprise the critical reevaluation of specific sites and building types, the discussion of recent fieldwork, the assessment of sculptural decoration, and new insights about the gymnasiarchy and ruler cult in gymnasia.

Development of Gymnasia and Graeco-Roman Cityscapes

EDITED BY

Ulrich Mania and Monika Trümper

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© 2018 Edition Topoi / Exzellenzcluster Topoi der Freien Universität Berlin und der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

Cover image: Doryphoros (Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli, inv. no. 6011; photo: D-DAI-ROM-69.634); Pompeii, Palaestra Sannitica, reconstructed section (Francois Mazois, Les ruines de Pompei III, Paris: Didot 1829, pl. XI fig. 1).

Typographic concept and cover design: Stephan Fiedler

Printed and distributed by
PRO BUSINESS digital printing Deutschland GmbH, Berlin

ISBN 978-3-9819685-0-7

ISSN (Print) 2366-6641

ISSN (Online) 2366-665X

DOI 10.17171/3-58

First published 2018

Published under Creative Commons Licence CC BY-NC 3.0 DE.

For the terms of use of third party content, please see the reference lists.

www.edition-topoi.org

CONTENTS

ULRICH MANIA, MONIKA TRÜMPER

Development of Gymnasia and Graeco-Roman Cityscapes — 7

ORIANA SILIA CANNISTRACI, RICCARDO OLIVITO

A *Gymnasion* at Segesta? A Review of the Archaeological and Epigraphic Evidence — 15

I GYMNASIA IN THE WESTERN MEDITERRANEAN

MONIKA TRÜMPER

Gymnasia in Eastern Sicily of the Hellenistic and Roman Period — 43

ALESSANDRA AVAGLIANO, RICCARDO MONTALBANO

Greek Gymnasia for Non-Greek People. Archaeological and Epigraphic Evidence in Pre-Roman Italy — 75

MONIKA TRÜMPER

Gymnasium, Palaestra, Campus and Bathing in Late Hellenistic Pompeii: A Reassessment of the Urban Context of the Republican Baths (VIII 5, 36) — 87

REBECCA HENZEL, MONIKA TRÜMPER

Crowded or Empty Spaces? The Statuary Decoration of the ‘Palaestrae’ in Pompeii and Herculaneum — 115

BURKHARD EMME

The Emergence and Significance of the Palaestra Type in Greek Architecture — 143

II GYMNASIA IN THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN

GUY ACKERMANN, KARL REBER

New Research on the Gymnasium of Eretria — 161

ULRICH MANIA

Gymnasial Buildings and Sanctuaries. A Contribution to the Formation of the Palaestra and an Interpretation of the So-Called ‘Echo Stoa’ — 181

ADA CARUSO

A New Athenian Gymnasium from the 4th Century BC? — 197

RICCARDO DI CESARE

Hellenistic Gymnasia in the Heart of Athens: Change and Continuity — 215

NATALIA KAZAKIDI

The Posthumous Depiction of Youths in Late Hellenistic and Early Imperial
Gymnasia — 237

RALF VON DEN HOFF

Ruler Portraits and Ruler Cult in the Pergamon Gymnasion — 253

DANIEL KAH

The Gymnasiarchia from the Hellenistic Age to the Roman Empire: the
Example of Rhodes — 273

MARCO VITALE

Interpreting the Plural ‘Gymnasia’ within the Context of Ruler Cult:
Buildings or Festivals? — 301

Development of Gymnasia and Graeco-Roman Cityscapes

1 Introduction

This publication is based on an international Topoi conference that was held in Berlin from the 4th to 6th February 2016 and emerged from the research group C-6 on Cityscaping, notably the project C-6-8 on *Bathing Culture and the Development of Urban Space: Case Study Pompeii*. The term ‘cityscaping’ denotes the process by which urban spaces were actively shaped, modeled, and appropriated in ancient cultures. Cityscaping embraces two perspectives: physical modeling and functionalizing of urban spaces through their architectural and urban-planning configurations (physical cityscaping), as well as literary modeling and functionalizing of urban spaces in texts that either concern the human actors and agents within these spaces or are composed by them (literary cityscaping).¹

The project in Pompeii investigates two public baths, the Republican Baths and the Stabian Baths, both built in the 2nd century BC, thus in Hellenistic Samnite Pompeii, and still used after 80 BC, when Pompeii became a Roman colony. While the Stabian Baths from the beginning included a palaestra, explicitly referred to as such in an inscription,² the Republican Baths have been identified as key element of a large complex that re-

sembled Greek gymnasia and included palaestra(e), running tracks and bathing facilities. Therefore, the project is much concerned with the significance of Greek gymnasia or, more generally, sports facilities in different cultural (Samnite, Roman) contexts.³ This, in turn, sparked interest in a wider contextualization and the importance of gymnasia in the western Mediterranean in the Hellenistic/Republican and Roman Imperial periods, which is overall little studied.⁴

An important reference for the phenomenon of physical and intellectual education in the western Mediterranean, for the institution and concept as well as space and building, is the Greek gymnasium in the eastern Mediterranean. While this has received much more attention than institutions and facilities in the west, the Greek gymnasium in the east requires a comprehensive reassessment. Ulrich Mania has recently taken up this challenge and completed a study on Gymnasia in the Hellenistic and Roman Imperial times in the east.⁵

Inspired by the concept of cityscaping, and by the complementary expertise on eastern (Mania) and western (Trümper) gymnasia, the aim of this conference was to examine the development of gymnasia and their impact on cityscapes and urban culture across the Mediterranean world. The gymnasium was one of the key mon-

1 A note on names and ancient terms: this volume includes papers from French-Swiss, German, German-Swiss, Greek, and Italian authors. While all papers are written in English, authors follow different traditions regarding names and ancient terms (e.g. gymnasium vs. gymnasium, palaestra vs. palaestra, Aristoteles vs. Aristotle etc.). These traditions have been respected and no unification has been enforced here. – Abbreviations of corpora correspond to the lists of abbreviations by DAI and BBaw, see: https://www.dainst.org/documents/10180/70593/02_ListeAbk%C3%BCrzungen_quer.pdf/2c74093b-c8b6-4c6a-8afi-17a155109505 und <http://ig.bbaw.de/abklatsche>.

2 CIL X, 829, inscribed shortly after 80 BC, refers to the restoration of the porticus and palaestra, which therefore both must belong to an earlier phase. The Topoi project C-6-8 has shown that the Stabian Baths were

only built at the end of 2nd century BC; thus, the original building already included a palaestra.

3 Terminology matters, but cannot be discussed in detail here. In the following, gymnasium stands for facilities for physical and intellectual education.

4 The C-6-8 project is complemented by a Topoi project on water management in Sicily, A-3-7, which focuses on bathing facilities, among others in palaestrae/gymnasia. This project inspired the paper on gymnasia in Sicily, see Trümper in this volume.

5 The manuscript “Gymnasien zwischen Hellenismus und römischer Kaiserzeit. Zur baugeschichtlichen Entwicklung einer Einrichtung der griechischen Polis. Mit einem Beitrag zu den beiden Gymnasien Prienes” will be submitted as German Habilitation at the University of Bonn.

uments for the formation of urban space and identity in Greek culture, and its transformation was closely interlinked with changing concepts of cityscaping. Knowledge as well as transfer of knowledge, ideas and concepts were crucial for the spread and long-lasting importance of gymnasia within and beyond the Greek and Roman world.

While the Greek gymnasium has been intensely investigated, the following brief overview reveals important gaps, which motivated the concept and structure of this conference.

2 State of Research

In 1960, J. Delorme published a comprehensive study on the Greek gymnasium, including discussion of all archaeological and written evidence known at this time. In the following decades, little research was carried out, apart from an unpublished PhD dissertation on the architecture of palaestra and gymnasium, written by G. L. Glass in 1981.⁶ From the 1990s onwards scholars started to ask more fundamental and evolutionary questions about the gymnasium. For example, in conference proceedings from 1995 H. von Hesberg published a short paper on the relationship between Greek gymnasium and polis. In the same volume, Ph. Gauthier investigated the institutional role of the gymnasium in the polis state and its significance as a place of sport and education, on the basis of inscriptions.⁷ Individual gymnasia such as those of Delos, Eretria, Messene, and Olympia were reassessed, discussing the relationship between epigraphic testimonies and archaeological evidence or dealing with the development of the buildings and their function in the post Hellenistic era.⁸ An important stimulus for research came from historical investigations like the commented edition of the gymnasia law from Beroia by Ph. Gauthier and M. B. Chatzopoulos, N. M. Kennel's work on the institution of the gymnasium and its user groups, and Ch. Mann's search for the origins of the gymnasium in the nexus of the military, sport and the social elite.⁹

In 2002 and 2007, the Frankfurt research group *Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel* organized two international conferences, on the gymnasium in the Hellenistic and the Roman Imperial periods, respectively. The focus of both conferences was on ancient historical topics and an analysis of written sources, including discussion of military and intellectual training, ephebate, gymnasiarchy and gymnasiarchs, and benefactors.¹⁰ Archaeological remains also played a significant role, however, and new questions were addressed, among these particularly the sculptural decoration of gymnasia.¹¹ The new holistic approach to gymnasia emphasized that the gymnasium gained in public importance and perception in the Hellenistic period which scholars associated with an increasingly bourgeois character of the institution.

The importance and use of the gymnasium in the Roman Imperial period had long been neglected in literature, but received significant attention in the last decade. In the context of his research on Roman bath-gymnasia, M. Steskal focused on the development of gymnasia in this period.¹² He interpreted the bath-gymnasia of Asia Minor in the tradition of the Hellenistic gymnasium. Also M. Trümper studied functional shifts of gymnasia between Hellenistic and Roman times and investigated the examples of Priene, Pergamon and Miletus, focusing on bathing facilities.¹³ Developments of the ephebate as a central part of the Hellenistic-Roman gymnasium were investigated by A. S. Chankowski and U. Wiemer.¹⁴ Wiemer demonstrated that the Athenian ephebate continued in Roman imperial times initially with even higher attendance figures and with the institution acquiring a more private and exclusive character with a high social reputation.

Most recently, C. Trombetti published a monograph on gymnasia in Greece with a special focus on their cultic and religious functions in the Hellenistic era.¹⁵ Another, yet unpublished dissertation on the built space and social dynamics of the gymnasium as a polis institution also focused on the Hellenistic era and did not include later developments.¹⁶

6 Delorme 1960; Glass 1981; Glass 1988.

7 von Hesberg 1995; Gauthier 1995.

8 Wacker 1996; Moretti 1996; Moretti 1997; Moretti 1998; Moretti 2001; Ferruti 1998–2000. Themelis 1999; Themelis 2013 and further papers by the same author since 1994; Mango 2003.

9 Kennel 1995; Kennel 2000; Kennel 2006; Kennel 2009; Gauthier and Chatzopoulos 1993; Mann 1998.

10 Kah and Scholz 2004; Scholz and Wiegandt 2015.

11 von den Hoff 2004; which in turned inspired new research: Kazakidi 2012; Kazakidi 2015; Mathys 2014; Mathys 2016.

12 Steskal 2003a; Steskal 2003b; Steskal 2007.

13 Trümper 2015.

14 Chankowski 2004; Chankowski 2010; Wiemer 2011.

15 Trombetti 2012; Trombetti 2013.

16 Skaltsa 2008.

While research on gymnasia since the 1990s is impressive and rich, significant gaps remain. The distinction between gymnasia in the Classical and Hellenistic ('Greek') periods vs. those of the Roman imperial period is maintained in most publications, as is obvious from recent studies focused on the Greek gymnasia and the concept of the two Frankfurt conferences.¹⁷ This distinction conceals developments, continuities and discontinuities between the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Apart from the recent focus on sculptural decoration, imagery related to the gymnasium has been little studied.¹⁸ Hardly investigated is the significance of the late Archaic and Classical images in vase painting for the early gymnasium.¹⁹ The same is true of many reliefs and especially grave reliefs which show sceneries understandable in the context of gymnasial activities. Finally, there is a lack of studies that focus on gymnasia outside the Greek world in the eastern Mediterranean,²⁰ but most notably in the western Mediterranean.

Finally, archaeological evidence of several important and well-preserved gymnasia remains largely unpublished or requires significant reassessment because of new fieldwork and methods.²¹ This also calls for a new synthesis of gymnasia, which would update Delorme's masterly study, using modern approaches and questions. This is the very aim of Mania's above mentioned comprehensive study.

3 Structure of Conference

Within the overarching framework of cityscaping, the conference tried to address some of the major gaps in research on gymnasia. It brought 26 scholars to Berlin, who gave 22 papers, organized in four thematic sessions that explored recently reassessed case-studies (I); self-perception and self-representation within the context of gymnasia (II); and broader cultural developments from an archaeological (III) and historical (IV) perspective. A particular concern was the inclusion of studies on sports facilities (gymnasium, palaestra, campus) in the western

Mediterranean and of studies that bridge the divide between the Hellenistic/Republican and Roman Imperial periods.

Not all scholars, who presented their research at the conference, could contribute to this volume, however, for various reasons. These papers, some of which will be published elsewhere, include a paper on the gymnasium at Cyrene between the Hellenistic and Late antique periods by Oscar Mei, Eleonora Gasparini and Filippo Venturini; Martin Gallagher's research on the gymnasium of Amphipolis; the study of gymnasia in Spain by Antonio López-García and Jorge García Sánchez; Francesco Ferruti's research on the transition from Greek gymnasium to Roman campus; Kathrin Weber's analysis of representations of the palaestra on Attic Vases; Florian Klauser's study on the statues of athletes in gymnasia; Michael Wörrle's study on female Gymnasiarchoi; and Stella Skaltsa's investigation of social mobility and new political power in the Late Hellenistic and Early Imperial period.

The fourteen papers published in this volume provide major contributions to many, if not all gaps in research, and are organized according to topography and topic. Representing the desired focus on the western Mediterranean, notably Sicily and southern Italy, five papers discuss the debated issue of identification; the layout, architecture and decoration; the significance in different socio-cultural and ethnic contexts (Avagliano and Montalbano; Cannistraci and Olivito; Trümper on Pompeii and on Sicily); as well as the sculptural decoration (Henzel and Trümper).

Seven papers deal with gymnasia in the eastern Mediterranean, discussing the emergence and significance of the palaestra as a building type (Emme); much debated questions of gymnasia in Athenian topography (Caruso, Di Cesare); recent fieldwork and reassessments of important case studies in Eretria (Ackermann and Reber) and Olympia (Mania); and aspects of the sculptural decoration, namely posthumous depictions of youths in Greek gymnasia (Kasakidi) and ruler portraits and ruler cult in Pergamon (von den Hoff).

17 Kah and Scholz 2004; Scholz and Wiegandt 2015; see, in contrast, the above-mentioned approaches and works that try to bridge these periods by M. Steskal, M. Trümper, U. Wiemer.

18 W. Raeck called for increased efforts to include visual studies in the research on gymnasia Raeck 2004, 364.

19 K. Weber tackled this topic in her master thesis submitted in Frank-

furt/Main in 2008 (Weber 2008).

20 See contributions on the importance of gymnasia for Hellenizing the east, Groß-Albenhausen 2004; or of gymnasia and gymnasiarchs in the Roman provinces Syria and Arabia; Daubner 2015.

21 Little published e.g.: palaestrae/gymnasia of Amphipolis and Solunto; new fieldwork and research: e.g. gymnasium of Eretria.

Finally, two papers discuss the important office of the gymnasiarchy in Rhodes (Kah) and more generally in Asia Minor (Vitale) where it was closely linked with the ruler cult.

While some papers focus on the Classical and Hellenistic periods (Ackermann and Reber; Emme; Mania), most papers discuss the Hellenistic and Roman Imperial times, thus providing the much required approach and perspective that bridge these seemingly distinct periods. This is not the space for a comprehensive assessment of cultural continuity and discontinuity of the gymnasium in different regions of the ancient world. Papers in this volume provide important contributions, however, for embarking on such studies in the near future, when yet more archaeological and written evidence of individual sites and regions has been thoroughly investigated.

This conference would not have been possible without the generous support and help of many people and

institutions whom we would like to acknowledge here: first and foremost, the Excellence Cluster Topoi and its directors, Gerd Graßhoff and Michael Meyer; the members of the Topoi research group C-6 on Cityscaping; Johanna Fabricius, Hans-Rupprecht Goette, Stephan Schmid and Claudia Tiersch, who led the four sessions of the conference; many persons who helped to organize the conference, most notably Katrin Siebel; and those persons who supported the publication of this book, among them particularly Kristina Bolz and the team of Edition Topoi, especially Nina Kraus and Dominika Szafraniec. Particular thanks are owed to the Gerda Henkel Foundation which funded Ulrich Mania's research visit to the University of Oxford between 2013 and 2015. During this visit, he significantly advanced his above-mentioned study of gymnasia and also came up with the idea of this conference.

Bibliography

Chankowski 2004

Andrzej S. Chankowski. "L'entraînement militaire des éphèbes dans les cités grecques d'Asie Mineure à l'époque hellénistique. Nécessité pratique ou tradition atrophée?" In *Les cités grecques et la guerre en Asie Mineure à l'époque hellénistique. Actes de la journée d'études de Lyon, 10 octobre 2003*. Ed. by J.-Ch. Couvenhes and H. L. Fernoux. Tours: Presses universitaires François-Rabelais, 2004, 55–76.

Chankowski 2010

Andrzej S. Chankowski. *L'éphébie hellénistique. Etude d'une institution civique dans les cités grecques des îles de la mer Egée et de l'Asie Mineure*. Paris: De Boccard, 2010.

Daubner 2015

Frank Daubner. "Gymnasia. Aspects of a Greek Institution in the Hellenistic and Roman Near East". In *Religious Identities in the Levant from Alexander to Muhammed. Continuity and Change*. Ed. by Michael Blömer, Achim Lichtenberger, and Rubina Raja. Turnhout: Brepols, 2015, 33–46.

Delorme 1960

Jean Delorme. *Gymnasion. Études sur les monuments consacrés à l'éducation en Grèce des origines à l'Empire romain*. Paris: De Boccard, 1960.

Ferruti 1998–2000

Francesco Ferruti. "Il ginnasio di Delo e l'inventario di Callistrato". *Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni italiane in Oriente* 76 (1998–2000), 219–234.

Gauthier 1995

Philippe Gauthier. "Notes sur le rôle du gymnase dans les cités hellénistiques". In *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus*. Ed. by M. Wörle and P. Zanker. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995, 1–11.

Gauthier and Chatzopoulos 1993

Philippe Gauthier and Miltiades V. Chatzopoulos. *La loi gymnasiarchique de Beroia*. Meletemata 16. Paris: Kentron Hellēnikēs kai Rōmaikēs Archaiotētos, Ethnikon Hidryma Ereunōn, 1993.

Glass 1981

Stephen L. Glass. *Palaistra and Gymnasium in Greek Architecture*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1981.

Glass 1988

Stephen L. Glass. "The Greek Gymnasium. Some Problems". In *The Archaeology of the Olympics. The Olympics and Other Festivals in Antiquity*. Ed. by W. J. Raschke. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988, 155–173.

Groß-Albenhausen 2004

Kirsten Groß-Albenhausen. "Bedeutung und Funktion der Gymnasien für die Hellenisierung des Ostens". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel 8. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 313–322.

von Hesberg 1995

Henner von Hesberg. "Das griechische Gymnasium im 2. Jh. v. Chr.". In *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus*. Ed. by M. Wörle and P. Zanker. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995, 13–28.

von den Hoff 2004

Ralf von den Hoff. "Ornamenta gymnasioide? Delos und Pergamon als Beispielfälle der Skulpturenausstattung hellenistischer Gymnasien". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 373–405.

Kah and Scholz 2004

Daniel Kah and Peter Scholz, eds. *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004.

Kazakidi 2012

Natalia Kazakidi. "Ένα οικογενειακό σύνταγμα ανδριάντων της εποχής του Κλαυδίου και το γυμνάσιο στη Σικυώνα". In *Κλασική παράδοση και νεωτερικά στοιχεία στην πλαστική της ρωμαϊκής Ελλάδας. Α' Διεθνές Συνέδριο Ρωμαϊκής Αρχαιολογίας, Θεσσαλονίκη, 7–9 Μαΐου 2009*. Ed. by Th. Stephanidou-Tiveriou, P. Karanastasi, and D. Damaskos. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 2012, 193–211.

Kazakidi 2015

Natalia Kazakidi. "Ένα οικογενειακό σύνταγμα ανδριάντων της εποχής του Κλαυδίου και το γυμνάσιο στη Σικυώνα". In *Κλασική παράδοση και νεωτερικά στοιχεία στην πλαστική της ρωμαϊκής Ελλάδας*. Ed. by Th. Stephanidou-Tiveriou, P. Karanastasi, and D. Damaskos. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 2015, 193–211.

Kennell 1995

Nigel M. Kennell. *The Gymnasium of Virtue. Education and Culture in Ancient Sparta*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.

Kennell 2000

Nigel M. Kennell. "The Status of the Ephebe". *Tyche* 15 (2000), 103–108.

Kennell 2006

Nigel M. Kennell. *Ephebeia: a Register of Greek Cities with Citizen Training Systems in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Hildesheim: Weidmann, 2006.

Kennell 2009

Nigel M. Kennell. "The Greek Ephebate in the Roman Period". *International Journal of the History of Sport* 26 (2009), 323–342.

Mango 2003

Elena Mango. *Das Gymnasium*. Eretria 12. Gollion: Infolio Éditions, 2003.

Mann 1998

Christian Mann. "Krieg, Sport und Adelskultur. Zur Entstehung des griechischen Gymnasiums". *Klio – Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte* 80 (1998), 7–21.

Mathys 2014

Marianne Mathys. *Architekturstiftungen und Ehrenstatuen. Untersuchungen zur visuellen Repräsentation der Oberschicht im späthellenistischen und kaiserzeitlichen Per.* Pergamenische Forschungen 16. Darmstadt: Philipp von Zabern, 2014.

Mathys 2016

Marinne Mathys. "Athleten im Gymnasion von Pergamon". In *Athletics in the Hellenistic World*. Ed. by C. Mann. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2016, 131–152.

Moretti 1996

Jean-Charles Moretti. "Le Gymnase de Délos". *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 120 (1996), 617–638.

Moretti 1997

Jean-Charles Moretti. "Les inventaires du gymnase de Delos". *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 121 (1997), 125–152.

Moretti 1998

Jean-Charles Moretti. "Graffites de la Palestre du lac à Délos". *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 122 (1998), 201–212.

Moretti 2001

Jean-Charles Moretti. "Le stade et les xystes de Délos". In *Constructions publiques et programmes éditaires en Grèce entre le IIe siècle av. J.C. et le Ier siècle ap. J.C. Actes du colloque organisé par l'Ecole française d'Athènes et le CNRS, Athènes 14–17 mai 1995*. Ed. by J.-Y. Marc and J.-Ch. Moretti. Paris: Ecole française d'Athènes, 2001, 349–370.

Raeck 2004

Wolfgang Raeck. "Archäologische Randbemerkungen zum griechischen Gymnasion". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 263–271.

Scholz and Wiegandt 2015

Peter Scholz and Dirk Wiegandt, eds. *Das kaiserzeitliche Gymnasion*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015.

Skaltsa 2008

Styliani Skaltsa. "Hellenistic Gymnasia: the Built Space and Social Dynamics of a Polis Institution". Dissertation Oxford. 2008.

Steskal 2003a

Martin Steskal. "Bemerkungen zur Funktion der Palästre in den ephesischen Bad-Gymnasium-Komplexen". *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien* 72 (2003), 227–239.

Steskal 2003b

Martin Steskal. "Die ephesischen Thermengymnasien. Zu Nutzbarkeit und Funktion eines kaiserzeitlichen Gebäudetypus im Wandel der Jahrhunderte". *Nikephoros* 16 (2003), 157–172.

Steskal 2007

Martin Steskal. "Griechische Gymnasien und römische Thermen". In *Neue Zeiten – Neue Sitten*. Ed. by M. Meyer. Vienna: Phoibos, 2007, 115–123.

Themelis 1999

Petros G. Themelis. "Die Statuenfunde aus dem Gymnasion von Messene". *Nürnberger Blätter zur Archäologie. Publikationsreihe des Bildungszentrums der Stadt Nürnberg, Fachbereich Archäologie* 15 (1999), 59–84.

Themelis 2013

Petros G. Themelis. "The 'Doryphoros' of Messene". In *Pompei/Messene. Il 'Doriforo' e il suo contesto*. Ed. by V. Franciosi and P. G. Themelis. Benincasa: Università degli Studi Suor Orsola Benincasa, 2013, 125–210.

Trombetti 2012

Catia Trombetti. "Gymnasien als sozialer Raum der Polis. Der Fall Athen". In *Orte des Geschehens. Interaktionsräume als konstitutive Elemente der antiken Stadt*. Ed. by C. Rödel-Braune and C. Waschke. LIT Verlag, 2012, 328–354.

Trombetti 2013

Catia Trombetti. *Il ginnasio greco. Genesi, topografia e culti dei luoghi della paideia*. BAR International Series 2527. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2013.

Trümper 2015

Monika Trümper. "Modernization and Change of Function of Hellenistic Gymnasia in the Imperial Period: Case-Studies Pergamon, Miletus and Priene". In *Das kaiserzeitliche Gymnasion*. Ed. by P. Scholz and D. Wiegandt. De Gruyter, 2015, 167–222.

Wacker 1996

Christian Wacker. *Das Gymnasion in Olympia: Geschichte und Funktion*. Vol. 2. Würzburg: Ergon-Verlag, 1996.

Weber 2008

Kathrin Weber. "Palaistradarstellungen der archaischen und klassischen Zeit auf attischen Vasen". Magisterarbeit Frankfurt a. M. 2008.

Wiemer 2011

Hans-Ulrich Wiemer. "Von der Bürgerschule zum aristokratischen Klub? Die athenische Ephebie in der römischen Kaiserzeit". *Chiron. Mitteilungen der Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 41 (2011), 487–537.

ULRICH MANIA

studied Classical Archaeology and History of Art at the University of Halle. His published dissertation deals with the sculpture and functional installations of the Red Hall in Pergamon. He was a team member of the excavations in Pergamon and Priene for many years, and Assistant Professor at the universities of Kiel and Bonn. After a three years as academic visitor at the University of Oxford he became research associate of the German Archaeological Institute Istanbul in May 2015.

Dr. Ulrich Mania
German Archaeological Institute
Inönü Cad. 10
34437 Istanbul – Gümüssuyu, Turkey
E-Mail: ulrich.mania@dainst.de

MONIKA TRÜMPER

Dr. phil. (Munich 1995), habilitation (Heidelberg 2005), is a Professor of Classical Archaeology at the Freie Universität Berlin and Spokesperson of the Berlin Graduate School of Ancient Studies for the FU. Her research focuses on Hellenistic and Roman architecture and urban studies, particularly domestic architecture, bathing culture, agorai/porticus, and commercial architecture. She did fieldwork in Delos and currently has excavation projects in Morgantina and Pompeii.

Prof. Dr. Monika Trümper
Freie Universität Berlin
Institut für Klassische Archäologie
Fabeckstr. 23–25
14167 Berlin, Germany
E-Mail: monika.truemper@fu-berlin.de

Oriana Silia Cannistraci, Riccardo Olivito

A *Gymnasion* at Segesta? A Review of the Archaeological and Epigraphic Evidence

Summary

Despite numerous inscriptions related to *gymnasia* and their magistracies in Sicily, our knowledge of their architecture is still fragmentary because safe identification of *gymnasia* is difficult and often debated. This exemplarily regards the Hellenistic city of Segesta, where excavations of the Scuola Normale Superiore in Pisa since the 1990s have exposed epigraphic evidence relating to a *gymnasion* and a peristyle building, next to the *bouleuterion*, that has been attributed to a *gymnasion*. This paper critically reviews this epigraphic and archaeological evidence and investigates what the sources really reveal and whether they can rightly be correlated. It is argued that currently only one single inscription testifies to the existence of the *gymnasiarchy* in Segesta, and that the peristyle building did not belong to a *gymnasion*, but to a coherently planned and built complex of political-administrative buildings.

Keywords: Segesta; epigraphy; *gymnasion*; *bouleuterion*; *agora*

Obwohl zahlreiche Inschriften aus Sizilien Gymnasia und ihre Ämter erwähnen, ist die Kenntnis der zugehörigen Architektur spärlich, weil die Identifizierung von Gymnasia oft umstritten ist. Das betrifft exemplarisch die hellenistische Stadt Segesta, in der Ausgrabungen der Scuola Normale Superiore Inschriften mit Bezug zu einem Gymnasion und einen Peristylbau freigelegt haben, der als Teil eines Gymnasions identifiziert worden ist. Dieser Beitrag untersucht kritisch die

entsprechenden epigraphischen und archäologischen Quellen und diskutiert, was sie aussagen und ob sie begründet verbunden werden können. Er zeigt, dass nur eine Inschrift die Existenz der Gymnasiarchie in Segesta belegt und der Peristylbau eher zu einem einheitlich geplanten Komplex politisch-administrativer Bauten gehörte.

Keywords: Segesta; Epigraphik; *gymnasion*; *bouleuterion*; *agora*

We would really like to thank the organizers of the Conference for giving us the opportunity to discuss some of the hypotheses we have formulated during our research in the *agora* of Segesta, Sicily. Besides, we are grateful to Carmine Ampolo and Maria Cecilia Parra, directors of the excavations, for allowing us to present the results of the investigations in this area of the *agora* of Segesta and for their very helpful considerations. We are also grateful to the Servizio Parco Archeologico di Segesta and its director, for their support and kindness in all the different phases of our research. Last but not least, we want to thank Agata Abate and Donatella Erdas for the very useful suggestions they gave us while working on this paper. Although this paper results from a common work, the overview, the paragraphs on methodological premises and epigraphic evidence as well as the conclusion are by Riccardo Olivito, and the others by Oriana Silia Cannistraci.

The wide and very interesting amount of critical issues and stimulating ideas that emerged from the conference held in Berlin in February 2016, has strongly encouraged us in presenting a review and new interpretation of the poor remains of a building in the *agora* of Segesta, by some scholars interpreted as the περίστυλος or *palaestra* of the local *gymnasion*.

Indeed, the question mark in the title of our paper not only aims at stressing the still existing problem of the presence of a *gymnasion* in the Sicilian town, but also at emphasizing the need for a thorough analysis of all the available data before identifying this kind of building on the ground.

As will be seen, the Segestan *gymnasion* can in fact represent a very interesting case study from an epigraphic, archaeological and hermeneutic point of view since its identification, as well as its existence, can be hypothesized, or even rejected, only on the basis of a deep examination of all the architectural, planimetric, topographical, and epigraphic evidence.

Thus, as far as Segesta is concerned, in this paper we will try to sum up the most recent findings in these different fields. The final goal is to verify whether or not the hypothesis of a Segestan *gymnasion* can be maintained.

After a brief overview of the urban context of the presumable Segestan *gymnasion*, namely the *agora* of Segesta, the epigraphic and archaeological evidence, which has been linked with a *gymnasion*, will be presented; in a second step, this evidence will be critically reassessed.

1 The *agora* of Segesta: an overview

The research by the Scuola Normale Superiore in the *agora* of Segesta started at the very beginning of the 90s, directed by Giuseppe Nenci and, after a long break, since 2001 they have been pursued under the direction of Carmine Ampolo and Maria Cecilia Parra (Pls. 1, 2).

The area involved in the excavation activities is characterized by a series of wide terraces, on different altimetric levels, resulting from the huge anthropic operations that, especially in the late Hellenistic period, were pursued in order to better define the monumental aspect of

the *agora* (Fig. 1).¹ Although occupied since the proto-historic age, and then more intensively in the archaic and classical periods, the main archaeological evidence dates back to the early Hellenistic, late Hellenistic and Roman Imperial periods. Indeed, at the beginning of the 3rd century AD the *agora*, and more generally speaking, the whole urban center was destroyed and had to be abandoned, probably due to a terrific earthquake. Only during the medieval age the three terraces were reoccupied and the ancient structures deeply spoliated in order to get new building material.

Although this paper will be mainly focused on the so-called ‘area of the *bouleuterion*’, that is the uppermost terrace of the *agora*, it is necessary to give a brief preliminary summary of the most recent excavations in the intermediate terrace, where the monumental remains of a more than 80 m long *stoa* have been discovered. This will be of great importance: indeed, it would be quite impossible to achieve a more complete reconstruction of the very articulated architectural design of the Segestan public square without bearing in mind that this portico, built at the end of the 2nd century BC, used to play a fundamental role in linking not only all the different altimetric levels involved in the monumentalization of the city center, but also the several buildings lying on them.

The portico was a building with two aisles and two stories, set up on a three stepped stylobate.² The lower colonnade, of Doric order, was ca. 6.6 m high (from the upper face of the stylobate to the upper face of the *geison*), whereas the upper Ionic colonnade, ca. 4.3 m high, was completed with a *sima* and lion head waterspouts. The total height of the *stoa* was ca. 11 m (Fig. 2). An intermediate row of octagonal pilasters divided the external aisle (ca. 5.80 m deep) from the internal one (ca. 5.5 m deep). The northern side of the building was 82 m long.

As to the internal planimetric organization, currently available data seem to demonstrate that the northern side of the *stoa* did not have rooms along the back wall. On the contrary, along the rear wall of the northern portico, some stone arches had been built in order to sustain and strengthen those points where the rock had been cut before the construction of the *stoa*.³

The eastern wing, although still not completely investigated, was ca. 20 m long and, in addition to the

1 Ampolo and Parra 2012; Parra 2006.

2 For the preliminary architectural study of the *stoa*, and in particular of

the western wing, see Abata and Cannistraci 2012.

3 Facella and Olivito 2013; Olivito and Serra 2014.




Fig. 1 Digital Terrain Model (DTM) of the *agora* of Segesta.




Fig. 2 3D reconstruction of the *stoa* in the *agora* of Segesta.

vertical sequence of Doric and Ionic colonnades, it was completed with at least one or perhaps two other stories, partially underground, open on the southern side of the square with a series of windows and doors, and probably used as stores and shops.⁴

The eastern wing is also the only area of the *stoa* where the presence of internal rooms has been verified. Indeed, a threshold has been discovered, demonstrating the presence of at least one small room in this part of the *ala*. Furthermore, at the intersection between the eastern

4 Ampolo and Parra 2016; Perna 2016.

and the northern portico, a large room has been identified (the so-called 'Ambiente I'), whose main entrance was marked by pilasters with semi-columns.⁵ Although its function is still unknown, the presence of burnt remains along the walls of the room, probably to be related to wooden shelves, might suggest an identification of the so-called 'Ambiente I' with an archive or a document depository.⁶

The western wing, ca. 20 m long, is the only one that has been completely investigated. Together with the two colonnaded stories, the west *ala* is characterized by the presence of stairs lying in the northwestern corner of the building and leading to the upper floor of the *stoa*. While demonstrating the physical link between the two stories of the portico, the presence of stairs, together with the total height of the *stoa* and the topographical relation with the near upper terrace, might demonstrate the existence of a connection between the buildings of the 'area of the *bouleuterion*' and the main sector of the Segestan *agora*, i.e. the one defined by the *stoa*. These two areas had to be part of a more articulated architectural complex in which the Council House and the peristyle building that we will examine in the following pages had to play a fundamental role.

Indeed, the two sectors were partially divided by a monumental road leading to the theater.⁷ As far as the *agora* is concerned, the monumental road was partially covered due to the presence of a *cryptoporticus*, in the southernmost part of the square, and had to be partially open in the area behind the western wing of the *stoa*.⁸

The planimetric and archaeological features of the road in the area south of the *agora* are more clearly articulated and easily reconstructed. Here, in fact, the new archaeological investigations have shown different structural elements, allowing us to clarify the intricate evolution of this urban sector.⁹

The earliest traces of monuments in this area can be dated back to the end of the 2nd century BC, when a portico was built. Its main function during the late Hellenistic period was the creation of a monumental scenography at the entrance of the *agora*.

Between the end of the 1st century BC and the very early years of the 1st century AD this area assumed greater importance, due to the construction of a small triangular square and the monumentalization of an already existing road leading to the theater, now paved with stone slabs. At the same time, about 2 m south of the stylobate of the late Hellenistic *stoa*, a circular building with a single door was built.

The construction of the circular building can be dated to the early 1st century AD, while the abandonment of this area and of the entire *agora* took place at the beginning of the 3rd century AD. Together with topographic considerations, the very abundant presence of butchered bones found in the floor levels within the building allowed for its identification as a *tholos macelli*, used as a slaughterhouse.¹⁰

Near the *macellum*, during the first decades of the 1st century AD a small triangular square was built, due to the euergetic activity of two local notables, *Onasus* and *Sopolis*, honored in an inscription, over 5 m long, incised on the slabs of this small square.

Finally, the *macellum* and the triangular square were separated by the already mentioned monumental paved street, which passed through the *cryptoporticus* and behind the western wing of the *stoa*, leading to the theater.

So far, we have quickly illustrated the main buildings of the *agora* and of the area south of the public square. With these structures and topographic features in mind, we can thus move to the upper terrace and the hypothetical presence of a *gymnasion* in this area of the town.

2 Methodological premises

The hypothetical identification of the so-called *gymnasion* of Segesta is an interesting example of archaeological hermeneutics. On the one hand, old readings of epigraphic documents that had been known for many centuries have been used in order to interpret the poor ar-

5 For the architectural study of the entrance to the 'Ambiente I' see Abate and Cannistraci 2013.

6 Cannistraci and Perna 2012, 13–14; Abate and Cannistraci 2013, 45–48.

7 For the road system of this urban sector see Facella and Olivito 2012; Olivito 2014b; Olivito 2017 [2018].

8 It is still uncertain how the presence of the road behind the western wing of the *stoa* influenced the physical connection between the upper terrace

and the late Hellenistic portico. Unfortunately, this issue is hardly investigable due to the construction, during the 50s of the 20th century, of a road leading to the theater. We will come back to this point in the following pages.

9 Facella and Olivito 2012; Olivito 2017 [2018].

10 Olivito 2014a.

chaeological remains of a peristyle building as part of a *gymnasion*.

On the other hand, the interpretation of the poor archaeological remains as traces of a *gymnasion* have been considered as an element validating old epigraphic readings. This circular process has led to the hypothesis of a *gymnasion* on the upper terrace of the *agora* of Segesta, close to the Council House (Pl. 3–4). As will be seen, the most recent findings in the epigraphic field, and a new analysis of the archaeological and topographical data, independent of the epigraphic ones, allow us to formulate new hypotheses. The main question is not whether or not Segesta had its own *gymnasion*, but rather whether or not we can identify the poor remains of the above mentioned peristyle building on the upper terrace with the περίστυλος, or *palaestra*, of the *gymnasion*.

3 Epigraphic and archaeological evidence: the construction of a hypothesis

3.1 Epigraphic evidence

As far as the Segestan epigraphic documentation is concerned, we rely on a corpus composed of five inscriptions concerning the organization and funding of public works at Segesta. All of the inscriptions – dating back to the period between the 4th and the 2nd century BC – have been studied by Giuseppe Nenci, who first formulated the hypothesis of the Segestan *gymnasion*. At present, the whole epigraphic dossier is under re-examination by Carmine Ampolo and Donatella Erdas.

IGDSII, no. 85 (SEG XLI, 827) represents the starting point for the assumption of a gymnasia institution at Segesta.

Though already mentioned by Giacomo Mangano,¹¹ the document was first published by Nenci, who discovered it in the repository of the Soprintendenza di Marsala.¹² Unfortunately, we know almost nothing

about the discovery of the inscription, except for the fact that it seems to have been discovered along the modern street leading to the theater.¹³

The text is inscribed on an architrave block of limestone, decorated with moldings on both the upper and lower parts. These features, together with the text itself, led Laurent Dubois to interpret it as a statue base.¹⁴

IGDSII, no. 85 (SEG XLI, 827)

Ed. IGDSII, no. 85:

[Ἀρτε]μιδώρα Νύμφονος τὸν αὐτάστα πατέρα
[Ἀρτέ]μιωνα Ἀλείδα γυμνασιάρχῃσαντα
[ἀνέθ]ηκε κατὰ διαθήκαν.

Artemidora (i.e. wife) of Nymphon, in accordance with a disposition by will, dedicated the statue of her own father, Artemon son of Aleidas, who was gymnasiarch.

The inscription, to be dated around the 4th and the 3rd century BC,¹⁵ or more precisely in the second half of the 3rd century BC¹⁶, presents several interesting elements as regards Segestan onomastics, which cannot be further investigated here.

As far as the Segestan *gymnasion* is concerned, we would like to stress that Artemidora is a very common anthroponym in Segesta, quite certainly linked with Artemis. Although we do not have any further information on Aleidas, Dubois has correctly suggested that the patronymic is typically Segestan and of local origin.

Then, we can conclude that the inscription IGDSII, no. 85 demonstrates the existence of the gymnasiarchal magistracy at Segesta, but it does not refer to any specific building, even less in the area of the *agora*.

Two other inscriptions with similar content have been traditionally linked with the *gymnasion*.

The first one is IG XIV, 291, unfortunately of unknown provenance, which has been dated by Margherita Guarducci to not before the middle of the 3rd century BC.¹⁷

IG XIV, 291 (IGDS, no. 216)

Ed. IGDS, no. 216:

11 Mangano 1980, 446 and with restoration of l.2, Mangano 1999, 66. See also Cordiano 1997, 45–46.

12 Inventory no. SG. 2024. See Nenci 1991, 926–927.

13 This is the only information that G. Nenci was able to collect from an oral communication with the custodian of the archaeological site.

14 IGDSII, 165–166.

15 Nenci 1991, 926.

16 IGDSII, 166.

17 See the commentary by Guarducci in Marconi 1931, 398. See also Nenci 1991, 923, pl. CCXCVIII, and Ampolo and Parra 2012, 278; Carmine Ampolo and Donatella Erdas. “Segesta. Un’iscrizione ellenistica nel suo contesto: nuovi apporti storico-epigrafici alla conoscenza della città”. *Notizie degli scavi di antichità comunicate dalla Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa S 5.10.2*. Forthcoming.

Ἱεροναμονεύων
 Τίττελος Ἀρτεμιδώρο[υ]
 τὰν ἐπιμέλειαν ἐποιήσα[το]
 τῶν ἔργων τοῦ ἀνδρεῶνο[ς]
 [κ]αὶ τὰς προέδρας μετὰ τ[ῶν]
 ἱεροφυλάκων.

While being hieromnamon, Tittelos son of Artemidoros took care of the works at the andreon and the proedra, together with the hierophylakes.

In addition to the important onomastic information, the text is particularly interesting for the references to the words ἀνδρεῶν and προέδρα.

As to the term ἀνδρεῶν, corresponding to the Attic form ἀνδρών¹⁸, that is men's apartment, Dubois suggested to interpret it as a possible equivalent to the Cretan word ἀνδρήιον, to be identified as the banqueting hall where the Cretan *syssitia* took place.¹⁹ In this regard, the association with the word προέδρα,²⁰ interpreted as a reference to the front and most important seats in a building (especially a theater), was of great importance for thinking of the Segestan ἀνδρεῶν as a particular building, that is a meeting hall for the town magistrates (i.e. a sort of *prytaneion*²¹), furnished with at least one row of front seats.²²

Dubois's thesis was firmly rejected by Nenci, who indeed suggested linking IG XIV, 291 to the presence of a *gymnasion* at Segesta, on the basis of another Segestan inscription, that is IGDSII, no. 89.²³

IGDSII, no. 89 (Marconi 1931, 397–399)

Ed. Ampolo and Parra 2012:

[...]
 ἱ]εροναμονέοντος
 Ἀ]ρτεμιδώρου Δόσσιος Γραδαναίου

τὸ δίπυλον οἱ ἀνδρεῶνες
 5 ἅ προέδρα ἐστεγάσθην ἐθυ–
 – – – -ς δις – – –

[...] *while being hieromnamon Artemidoros, son of Dossis Gradanaios, the dipylon, the andreones, and the proedra were covered.*

The inscription records work activities for the covering of the δίπυλον, the ἀνδρεῶνες, and the προέδρα: then, its object is similar to that of the previous document, although they are not contemporary, since, according to Ampolo and Erdas, IGDSII, no. 89 dates back to the 2nd century BC.²⁴ Thus, in Nenci's view, similarly to the singular ἀνδρεῶν, the plural ἀνδρεῶνες might refer to the presence of several male rooms, as well as of a προέδρα, within the *gymnasion* of Segesta: "[...] nel qual caso non andranno ricercati a Segesta i resti di un ginnasio e di un ἀνδρεῶν, ma solo del ginnasio".²⁵ At the same time, differently from what he stated in the case of the singular ἀνδρεῶν, Dubois suggested that: "Les ἀνδρεῶνες pourraient être ici des salles du gymnase dévolues à la catégorie des ἄνδρες".²⁶

On the contrary, in commenting on the inscription, Guarducci linked it with the theater,²⁷ thinking of additions to this building by the *hieromnamon* Artemidoros.²⁸ In particular, Guarducci thought the ἀνδρεῶνες to be a sort of banqueting rooms reserved for the men of the town, whereas the προέδρα would have been a space reserved for the meeting of the *proedri*. Indeed, well noticed by Ampolo, in this case it is important to consider that the indication of a roof as the object of the work activity, seems in fact to allow us to exclude that we are dealing with a row of seats:²⁹ in fact, it is more likely that

18 IGDS, 273–274. The form ἀνδρεῶν is attested in Hdt. I, 34.

19 For an epigraphic reference to the Cretan ἀνδρήιον, see e.g. GDI, 4992, a, II, 9. Unfortunately, we still do not have enough data on the Cretan institution, both from a socio-historical and an archaeological point of view. As a result, it is quite impossible to state a certain comparison between the Segestan ἀνδρεῶν and the Cretan ἀνδρήιον. On the Cretan institution of the ἀνδρήιον/ἀνδρεῖα (explicitly recalled by Dosiadas [FGH Hist 458, fr. 2, 5–15], apud Ath. IV, 143b) see among others Lavrencic 1988 and, more recently, Perlman 2014, 185–192 (with previous literature).

20 For the form προέδρα, equal to προεδρία, see e.g. IG V, 2, 113, from Tegea.

21 On Greek *prytaneia* see Miller 1978; Hansen and Fischer-Hansen 1994, 30–37; Emme 2013, 86–122.

22 See IGDS, 274.

23 Inventory no. SG 2004. See also Nenci 1991, 923–924 pl. CCXCIX, 1;

SEG LIX, 825; Ampolo and Parra 2012, 278; Ampolo and Erdas forthcoming (see fn. 17).

24 See also the commentary by Guarducci in Marconi 1931, 399.

25 Nenci 1991, 923.

26 IGDSII, 168.

27 This suggestion was probably influenced by the provenance of the inscription that was discovered near the theater as recorded in a communication by Marconi to the custodian of the archaeological area. For the transcription of this communication (dated 27th May 1927) see Nenci 1991, 924 n. 20.

28 See Guarducci in Marconi 1931, 399: "Dato il luogo di rinvenimento, si può supporre che essa (i.e. the inscription) possa in qualche modo essere messa in relazione con il teatro greco [...]"

29 Ampolo and Parra 2012, 278; Ampolo and Erdas forthcoming (see fn. 17), *passim*.

we are dealing here with covered rooms and/or structures, composing a larger and more articulated architectural complex.

A further probable evidence of the interesting role played by the ἀνδρεῶνες at Segesta might be represented by the most fragmentary inscription of the whole Segestan dossier, published by Nenci in 1991.³⁰

Nenci 1991, 921, no. 1 (SEG XLI, 826)

Ed. Nenci 1991, 921, no. 1:

[τοῖς] Δι[οσκούροις]
[οἱ τριτίρε]γες καὶ οἱ ἀνδρ[ες]
[συγκατασκ]ευασθέντες

Ed. SEG XLI, 826:

[- -]ΔΙ[- -]
[- -] γες καὶ οἱ ΑΝΔ[- -]
[- - -]ευασθέντες

The text, inscribed on a limestone block whose original context is unknown, was interpreted by Nenci as a dedication to the *Dioskouroi* by two groups of people, that is the τριτίρενες (i.e. the *epheboi* of the third year) and the ἀνδρες. The obvious deduction was that these two groups were part of those attending the Segestan *gymnasion* and that the final verb had to be restored as [συγκατασκ]ευασθέντες, or, as an alternative as [κατασκ]ευασθέντες. Thus, a further link with gymnasial activity was stated by Nenci, on the basis of the association between the κατασκευή and the Greek *gymnasion*.³¹

More recently, Ampolo has reexamined this document noting that although the readings by Nenci are correct, the restoration of the missing text, and consequently its interpretation, is highly hypothetical.³² In particular, rather than reading οἱ ἀνδρ[- -] and restoring it as οἱ ἀνδρ[ες], it can be restored as οἱ ἀνδρε[ῶνες].³³ The final verb is more convincingly identified as the third person plural of the passive aorist tense of ἐπισκευάζω. Therefore, the inscription would have no di-

rect link to the gymnasial institution.

Finally, the last but still most important document that Nenci used in order to strengthen the thesis of the Segestan *gymnasion* is IG XIV, 290 (IGDS, 215).³⁴

Similarly to the previously examined documents, also in this case we have to remember that the original provenance of the inscription, now stored in the public library of Calatafimi (TP, Sicily), is unknown. At the same time, the chronology of the inscription can only be stated on the basis of a paleographic analysis. This is obviously a fairly problematic issue, as demonstrated by the different hypothetical dates suggested for the document: end of the 4th century BC according to Nenci,³⁵ 2nd century BC, according to Ampolo.³⁶

The text is inscribed on a *tabula ansata* and was first published by Nenci, still lacking its left side.

IG XIV, 290 (IGDS, 215):

[Ιερ]οθυτέοντος Φάωνος
[τοῦ Νύμ]φωνος Σωπολιανοῦ,
[ἀγορα]νομέοντος Ξενάρχου
[τοῦ Δι]οδώρου καὶ τὰν ἐπιμέλειαν
5 [ποιη]σαμένου τῶν ἔργων
[τοῦ ξυσ]τοῦ ἃ κατεσκευάσθη.....

While being ierothyas Phaon son of Nymphos Sopolianos, while being agoranomos Xenarchos son of Diodoros, he (i.e. Xenarchos) took care of the works realized to the xystos.

It is obvious that in this case the most important element for our discussion is in line 6. Indeed, since the work of Désiré Raoul Rochette,³⁷ this part of the text has been restored with the word [τοῦ ξυσ]τοῦ. Although this reading had been already rejected by Jean Delorme,³⁸ both Nenci³⁹ and Dubois⁴⁰ accepted the restoration by Raoul Rochette and, consequently, used it as a very meaningful and convincing element supporting the thesis of a *gymnasion* at Segesta.

It is important to recall this element since, as we will see later, the general sense of the inscription has been

30 Inventory no. SG 2007. Nenci 1991, 921–923 pl. CCXCVI; see also Ampolo and Parra 2012, 278–279.

31 Nenci 1991, 922. In this regard, Nenci recalled Oehler 1912.

32 Ampolo and Parra 2012, 279.

33 As to the τριτίρενες, this is a very rare term, only attested in a 2nd century BC ephebic list from the Messenian town of Thouria (IG V, 1, 1386). For this reason, Nenci's restoration seems to be unlikely. For a review of this term and the others linked to it, see Lanérès 2008.

34 The inscription was already known to Gualtherus; Gualtherus 1624, 49, no. 322.

35 Nenci 1991, 924.

36 Ampolo and Parra 2012, 278.

37 Raoul Rochette 1836, 94.

38 Delorme 1960, 288 n. 7; 487.

39 Nenci 1991, 923.

40 IGDS, 273.

deeply modified by recent research on Segestan epigraphy.

3.2 Archaeological evidence

The upper terrace of the *agora* of Segesta (Pl. 1) occupies a wide plateau south of the Hellenistic theater, which is located on a higher level than the terrace of the *stoa*. In the 1990s, excavations revealed monuments belonging to different epochs: in particular, a fortified medieval village set directly upon the remains of a late Hellenistic *bouleuterion*, a peristyle building, and a late Archaic structure (perhaps a temple).⁴¹ Scanty remains of a pre-historic settlement complete the archaeological frame, whereas remains from the Roman Imperial period are conspicuously absent. This suggests continuous use of the Hellenistic buildings in the Roman period or complete abandonment after the 'Romanization' of Segesta, in the first decades of the 1st century AD.

As to the ancient structures, the best preserved building is the *bouleuterion*, whose maximum capacity was 150–200 seats (Pl. 5).

From a typological point of view, the Segestan Council House can be inserted into the group of Sicilian *bouleuteria* (among others that of Soluntum and Agrigento) characterized by a semicircular *cavea* inscribed within a rectangular building, and completed with a frontal portico.⁴² Indeed, this type can be directly compared with the Hellenistic *bouleuterion* of Miletus and, more generally speaking, with other *bouleuteria* in Asia Minor such as those of Iasos and Nysa.⁴³ Like the latter, the *bouleuterion* of Segesta had an *ambulatory* running under the last two rows of seats, accessible from the north and allowing the council members to reach the *summa cavea* through a small staircase.⁴⁴

A small tetrastyle portico and a monumental inscription, to be dated to the 2nd century BC, emphasized the main entrance to the *bouleuterion*. The text, inscribed on four limestone slabs, recorded the dedication of the building by the ἐπιστάτης Asklaḗpos, son of Diorodos, and the architect Bibakos, son of Tittelos.⁴⁵

Further investigations allowed archaeologists to verify that two slabs of a stylobate, discovered on the southeastern side of the *bouleuterion*, were part of a portico running in front of the western wing of the *stoa* and, perhaps, along the road leading to the theater (Pls. 3–5).

Two different architectural phases have been identified: the first dated to the end of the 4th century or the early 3rd century BC; and the second dated to the end of the 2nd century BC. Whereas elements of the first phase are very poorly preserved, the second phase is well represented by stratigraphic evidence, architectural features and epigraphic evidence (i.e. the above mentioned monumental inscription).

To the southwest of the *bouleuterion*, since 1989, remains of a peristyle building with paved floor, colonnade, and rear wall were revealed under various walls of the medieval Swabian village (Pl. 3, Fig. 3). The peristyle building is partially preserved. Only four limestone slabs of the stylobate are still visible on the ground. The analysis of the stylobate allowed a reconstruction of a column with smooth shaft and a lower diameter of ca. 0.75 m. The interaxial span is not homogeneous, ranging from 2.5 to 2.7 m, probably because of subsequent modifications. The preserved length of the stylobate on the northern side of the peristyle is 11.30 m. On the southeastern side of the building a monumental threshold for a door with two leaves has been discovered (Fig. 4). In front of it, traces of a drainpipe were found. Unfortunately, it is still impossible to assign any of the architectural elements that were found during the excavations or were reused in the medieval walls to this portico.

In addition to the remains of the colonnade and the threshold, a small portion of a wall running from east to west, probably part of the rear wall of the building, and some portions of a floor composed of square bricks, 20 cm large and 8 cm thick (Fig. 5), are the only other surviving components of the peristyle complex. This kind of pavement, discovered in two points along the northern and eastern areas of the peristyle, can be well compared to other examples from Segesta.⁴⁶ It also has parallels in Hellenistic buildings outside Segesta, such as

41 Parra 1997. The complete publication of the *bouleuterion* and all the structures on the upper terrace is forthcoming.

42 Parra 2006, 109–112.

43 Parapetti 1985; Balty 1991, 444–453; Johannowsky 1994.

44 Besides, it is likely that the *ambulatory* led to an underground room that may have been an archive or a storage room.

45 For the inscription see: Nenci 2000, 810–811; IGDSII, 167, no. 88. This inscription is also under re-examination by Ampolo.

46 Cf. the brick floor in the so-called Southwestern *stoa*, near the *tholos macelli*; Benelli et al. 1995, 685; or the well-preserved floor in the eastern *ala* of the *stoa* in the *agora*; Cannistraci and Perna 2013, 19–20; Abate and Giaccone 2014, 33–35.



Fig. 3 Aerial view of the remains of the peristyle building on the upper terrace of the *agora* of Segesta.



Fig. 4 Peristyle building: the threshold at the main entrance.



Fig. 5 Floor with square bricks in the area of the peristyle building.

the *stoa* in the *agora* of Halaesa⁴⁷ and the *agora* of Soluntum.⁴⁸

As frequently attested at Segesta, the area of the peristyle was heavily reused in the medieval age. Spoliation and reuse of the Hellenistic structures were not limited to the walls, but also involved the central paved courtyard, whose *lacunae* were filled with smaller slabs recovered in other buildings. For this reason, we have no evidence allowing for the reconstruction of the original size of the peristyle and, consequently, of the general plan of the building.

Despite the poor state of preservation, the remains can be identified as a four-sided peristyle, of which only two colonnades survived. The building had a monumental entrance with a large threshold on its eastern side, possibly along the road leading to the theater. Rooms with brick pavements may have opened to the northeastern side of the peristyle. While this building can safely be interpreted as a *περίστυλος*, its proposed identification as a *palaestra* of a *gymnasion*,⁴⁹ requires critical revision.

4 Epigraphic and archaeological evidence: reassessment

4.1 Epigraphic evidence: reassessment

It is obvious that the identification of a *gymnasion* in Segesta is based on a circular interpretative process, where the inscriptions have been interpreted and restored on the basis of the poor archaeological remains and, at the same time, the architectural evidence has been read with the aid of a highly lacunose epigraphic dossier. Both epigraphic and archaeological evidence require careful independent reassessment.

We would first like to highlight a few very meaningful points derived from Ampolo's new readings and interpretations of some of the above-mentioned inscriptions.⁵⁰ As we have seen, the most significant epigraphic

evidence for the hypothesis of the Segestan *gymnasion* has been the reference to the *ξυστός* in the inscription IG XIV, 290.⁵¹ Nevertheless, in 2003 a very important discovery was made during the excavations in the *agora*:⁵² the missing left part of the inscribed stone, which has allowed Ampolo to correct the previous reading of the text (Fig. 6). On the basis of the new fragment we can now correctly reconstruct the name of the *agoranomos*, which is Xenarchos, son of Apollodoros, rather than the previously read Diodoros son of Apollodoros.⁵³ More importantly, the new fragment has allowed Ampolo to definitively exclude the presence of the genitive τοῦ ξυστοῦ in line 6. The first letter of line 6 is an α, whereas the following letter, partially preserved, can be only intended either as a second α or, more likely, as a λ. Although this means that the possibility to validate the restoration of this term on the basis of the *περίστυλος* on the upper terrace of the *agora* cannot be considered valid anymore, it does not mean that the connection with a *gymnasion* at Segesta has to be completely rejected.

In this sense, granted that at the beginning of line 6 the letters αλ can be read, and that Gualtherus' and Nenci's reading of the first letters of the other block of the inscription is correct (i.e. του), could we still think of an inscription somehow connected with the Segestan *gymnasion*? Ampolo has convincingly shown that the genitive form of the term τό ἀλειπτήριον (that is the place for anointing in *gymnasia*) must be excluded because this word is too long.⁵⁴ However, it is difficult to think of other possible restorations without risking misunderstanding the actual and original sense of the inscription. Thus, while waiting for the forthcoming edition of the Segestan epigraphic *corpus*, it will be better to simply consider this document as a further demonstration of the activity by an outstanding citizen, Xenarchos, who personally funded the construction and care of several works, though not necessarily those in the *gymnasion*.⁵⁵ Ampolo succinctly summarizes the significance of the epigraphic evidence as follows:

47 Tigano 2012, 138.

48 Cutroni Tusa et al. 1994, 31–32; Wolf 2013, 21–22.

49 First hypothesized by Nenci 1991, the identification of this structure with the Segestan *gymnasion* on the upper terrace of the *agora* has been later supported by other scholars: see Michelini 1997, 1148–1150; De Cesare and Parra 2000, 278; Mango 2009, 764–765.

50 As we have already pointed out, a new edition of the whole Segestan epigraphic dossier by Ampolo and Erdas is forthcoming (see fn. 17). Though, some of the most innovative elements derived from his examination have been preliminarily presented in Ampolo and Parra 2012,

278–280.

51 See above.

52 Erdas and Gagliardi 2003, 427–428.

53 Ampolo and Parra 2012, 278.

54 Ampolo and Parra 2012, 278. As far as the *gymnasion* is concerned, the term τό ἀλειπτήριον is attested among others at Delos (IG XI, 2 199, l. 105) and Thera (IG XII, 3, 1314).

55 On the meaning of the verb κατασκευάζειν in this kind of inscription see also Ampolo 2008, 25–26.



Fig. 6 Cast of IG XIV, 290 (IGDS, 215) with the newly-discovered fragment on the left.

Questo gruppo di iscrizioni menziona sia la cura (*epimeleia*) dei lavori di costruzione di alcune strutture sia la costruzione od esecuzione di alcune opere. Le iscrizioni sono simili per forma (i.e. mainly in form of *tabulae ansatae*) e caratteri, ma non totalmente identiche. Probabilmente sono vicine nel tempo, ma non furono eseguite contemporaneamente. Esse coinvolgono personaggi diversi per varie operazioni di cura di lavori o di esecuzione vera e propria, che ricevertero per questo una statua onoraria e l'iscrizione.⁵⁶

Thus, reassessment of the epigraphic evidence yields the following picture:

1. The inscriptions which mention a δῖπυλον, the ἄνδρεών or ἄνδρεῶνες and the προέδρα are of unknown provenance (IG XIV, 291 and SEG XLI, 826) or seem to have been discovered in the area of the theater (IGDSII, no. 89). Consequently, the possibility of linking them with a *gymnasion* lying in the area of the public square, and in particular with the peristyle building near the *bouleuterion*, must be very carefully re-considered. As a hypothesis, we cannot even exclude a connection with structures lying in the area close to the theater.
2. Rather than automatically suggesting a relation between the terms ἄνδρεών/ἄνδρεῶνες and the local *gymnasion*, we can refer them to rooms reserved to

male citizens, possibly having a political or administrative function (e.g. as *prytaneion*) and totally independent from the gymnasial institutions. The inscription SEG XLI, 826, where a possible reference to the τριτίπενες and the ἄνδρες was reconstructed, has recently been interpreted as further evidence of work activity involving the ἄνδρεῶνες.

3. Only IGDSII, no. 85 can demonstrate that in the 3rd century BC the institution of the γυμνασιαρχία did exist in Segesta.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, it cannot be connected with a specific building of the town, let alone the peristyle building near the *bouleuterion*.
4. Most importantly, the hypothesis of a ξυστός at Segesta, so far considered as the most important proof of the existence of a *gymnasion*, is refuted by the recent discovery of a new fragment of IG XIV, 290.

4.2 Archaeological evidence: reassessment

Based on new evidence derived from an up-to-date analysis of the epigraphic dossier, and especially after having demonstrated how the hypothetical identification of the *gymnasion* with the structures on the upper terrace of the *agora* actually relied on a wrong reconstruction of the epigraphic texts, we would like to definitively separate the epigraphic data from the peristyle near the *bouleuterion*, suggesting a new interpretation of the archaeo-

⁵⁶ Ampolo and Parra 2012, 279. On the euergetic activities in many of the most important cities of western Sicily see also Campagna 2007.

⁵⁷ A still unpublished inscription, probably of ephebic nature, could possi-

bly represent further evidence of the existence of a *gymnasion*. For a short note see Parra 2006, 107 n. 5. The forthcoming edition of the Segestan epigraphic dossier by Ampolo will shed new light on this document.

logical evidence on the basis of its topographic and architectural nature.

With regard to this, we need to mention some archaeological features that have not been sufficiently highlighted so far:

1. First, the floors of the *bouleuterion* and of the peristyle building lie at the same level. In our view, this suggests unity of planning (Pl. 6).
2. Second, while delimiting the southwestern side of the *bouleuterion*, the western wall of the *ambulacrum* of the Council House had to define also the north-eastern side of the peristyle building. In our view, this element can allow for the hypothesis of a common architectural project which linked these buildings planimetrically and structurally with one another.
3. Third, the southern wall of the *bouleuterion* is aligned with the monumental threshold of the peristyle, so that we can imagine a long common front wall for the two buildings.
4. Finally, a further element which speaks for a unified plan is represented by the poorly preserved stylobate blocks that we think of as part of a colonnade running ca. 3.5 m south of the two buildings. Indeed, two limestone slabs with traces of the lowest part of the column are preserved, allowing us to reconstruct a base diameter of 60 cm. This measure is comparable with the lower diameter of the columns composing the portico in front of the *tholos macelli*. Thus, we can reconstruct a colonnade running quite perfectly parallel to the southern wall of the *bouleuterion* and, more importantly, partially facing the peristyle building with its southernmost stylobate block. On the basis of this assumption, can we then imagine a long single-aisled portico, its final purpose being the creation of an architecturally unifying scene

for the road leading to the theater? Such an urban planning solution would not be without parallels since, as already shown by Roland Martin, especially in the Hellenistic period colonnades and porticoes were increasingly used as tools for the unification of the front walls of spaces and buildings with different functions,⁵⁸ especially those playing a political role. Indeed, as Burkhard Emme has correctly noticed: “Erst in der nachfolgenden, hellenistischen Zeit ist verschiedentlich eine Tendenz zur Vereinheitlichung der Agora-Randbebauung zu erkennen, indem verschiedenen Gebäuden politischer Funktion eine einheitliche Säulenhalle vorgelegt wurde.”⁵⁹ Similarly, Barbara Sielhorst has recently argued that, in the Hellenistic period, the *stoai*: “sorgten für eine Vereinheitlichung der Gebäudefronten.”⁶⁰

Once we have assumed a possible project unity for the two above-mentioned buildings, it is not hard to find comparisons for a combination between a *bouleuterion* and a peristyle complex. Generally speaking, several late Hellenistic *bouleuteria* and particularly that of Miletus (Fig. 7),⁶¹ which became a model for many of the Sicilian Council Houses,⁶² show that the *bouleuterion* was often completed with a portico devoted to the activities of the *bouleutai*.

As far as the Sicilian examples are concerned,⁶³ we would first like to recall the case of the earlier *bouleuterion* of Iaitas (Fig. 8).⁶⁴ Here a small *bouleuterion*, whose construction has been differently dated from the end of the 4th century BC to the middle of the 2nd century BC, has been discovered at the northwestern corner of the public square.⁶⁵ Similarly to the *bouleuterion* of Segesta, that of Iaitas had a *cavea* (60–70 seats maximum) inscribed in a small rectangular room. The Council House was accessible directly from the portico defining the northern side of the *agora* (the so-called ‘North *stoa*’), through a wide

58 Martin 1951, 490–494 and 502. See also Lauter 1986, 124–127.

59 Emme 2013, 92.

60 Sielhorst 2015, 54.

61 Knackfuss 1908; Schaaf 1992, 37–60, with previous literature.

62 On the influence of the *bouleuterion* of Miletus on the Sicilian Council Houses see Campagna 2006, 28.

63 For a general overview on the Sicilian *bouleuteria*, see Isler 2003 and, more recently and briefly, Campagna 2006, 25–28; Wolf 2013, 67–70 pl. 113. More generally speaking, on the *bouleuterion* see McDonald 1943;

Gneisz 1990; Balty 1991, 429–600; Hansen and Fischer-Hansen 1994, 37–44.

64 On the earlier *bouleuterion* of Iaitas see Isler 2012, 230–231 with earlier literature. A later *bouleuterion*, larger than the first, has been discovered on the western side of the *agora*: see Isler 2012, 232–233.

65 A 4th century BC chronology is suggested by Isler 2003, 429–431 and Isler 2011. On the contrary, a 2nd century BC date is firmly sustained by other scholars: see in particular Campagna 2006, 28.




Fig. 7 Plan of the *bouleuterion* of Miletus.




Fig. 8 Plan of the *bouleuterion/pytaneion* complex on the northern side of the *agora* of Iaitas.

opening that led to the rear part of the *cavea*.⁶⁶ Apart from the analogies with the Segestan *bouleuterion*, the combination of the *bouleuterion* with a peristyle building are of particular interest here. Indeed, joined to the eastern wall of the Iaitas Council House and, accessible from the 'North *stoa*', an open court with 4 x 5 columns has been discovered. Still, on the western wall of the

peristyle, a partially preserved threshold connecting the peristyle with the *orchestra* of the *bouleuterion*, definitely demonstrates the existence of a planimetric, and consequently functional unity between the two buildings.

Furthermore, the unity existing between the Iaitas *bouleuterion* and the peristyle, was emphasized due to

⁶⁶ According to Isler, during the 2nd century BC the width of the entrance to the *bouleuterion* was drastically reduced, due to the construction of a *podium* with a small staircase in the northwestern corner of the *stoa*. This

structure has been interpreted as the *tribunal* of the new Roman town: see Isler 2012, 230.

the role played by the ‘North *stoa*’, which, as correctly pointed out by Hans Peter Isler, was not

un elemento autonomo, ma formava un complesso monumentale insieme ad un edificio pubblico retrostante con il quale ha il muro occidentale in comune. Il complesso retrostante si compone della prima sala di consiglio di Iaitas [...] e di un cortile a colonne, cioè un peristilio, antistante i due locali, con quattro colonne in senso Nord-Sud e cinque in senso Est-Ovest.⁶⁷

Without a doubt, there is a strong analogy in the use of a columned façade unifying the *bouleuterion* and the peristyle building in both the cases of Segesta and Iaitas. In our view, this is a very meaningful element for the interpretation of the peristyle as a space somehow functionally connected to, or depending on, the Council House rather than as a *gymnasium*.

The comparison between Iaitas and Segesta is even more revealing if we look at the building that we have already defined as the model for many of the Sicilian *bouleuteria*, i.e. is the *bouleuterion* of Miletus. One of the main architectural features of this building was the presence of a wide columned open courtyard preceding the main entrances to the Council House. Here the relation between the *bouleuterion* and the peristyle is so intrinsic that they have to be conceived as a single unity.⁶⁸ A very similar relation seems to characterize the cases of Segesta and Iaitas, although in the former the peristyle is not preceding the main entrance to the *bouleuterion* but rather completing its rear side.

Furthermore, we are well informed about the combination of the *bouleuterion* with other buildings, mainly having a central open courtyard, from both epigraphic and archaeological sources.⁶⁹ As Maria Cecilia Parra has

noticed,⁷⁰ from an epigraphic point of view a very interesting comparison for such an architectural and planimetric composition can be found in the decrees in honor of Archippe, benefactress of Kyme who funded the construction and repairs of the *bouleuterion* and the sanctuary of *Homonoia*.⁷¹ On the one hand, the decrees refer to celebrations offered by Archippe, to be held within the *bouleuterion*; on the other hand, while recalling the thanksgiving for the extraordinary euergetic activity of Archippe, one of the inscriptions refers to the dedication of the golden bronze statue of the benefactress, set up on a marble column standing in the enclosure of the *bouleuterion* (ἐν τῷ περιβόλῳ τοῦ βουλευτηρίου).⁷² According to Ivana Savalli-Lestrade, the celebrations recorded in these decrees had to be not only limited to the very Council House, but also to the nearby area and in particular to the περίβολος, to be understood as a large open courtyard surrounded by covered porticoes on at least three sides.⁷³ Thus, this structure would appear as a component of the *bouleuterion* complex or, in other words, as a well-equipped monumental space integrating the small area of the *auditorium* itself. In this sense, Parra is probably right in thinking of a structure preceding the *bouleuterion*,⁷⁴ similar to what we have seen in the case of the peristyle preceding the *bouleuterion* of Miletus (which is thought to have represented the model also for the *bouleuterion* of Kyme)⁷⁵ and Iaitas.

Still on the basis of Parra’s considerations, we could recall other famous combinations of *bouleuterion* and περίβολος/peristyle.⁷⁶ This is the case of Iasos, with the Council House joined to the περίβολος of Artemis Astiàs,⁷⁷ and that of the ‘A and Γ buildings’, joint to the peristyle of the *Asklepieion* of Messene, which have been identified with the local *ekklesiasterion/odeion* and *bouleuterion/synedrion*.⁷⁸

67 Isler 2012, 230.

68 Tuchelt 1975, 114. 120.

69 On the frequent combination of *bouleuterion* and buildings with an open courtyard see Hamon 2005. We also know of buildings that are commonly interpreted as *bouleuteria* but could have had a different function, see Kockel 1995, 35–37.

70 Parra 2006, 109.

71 IGSK, 13=SEG XXXIII, 1035–1041. See among others Savalli-Lestrade 1993; Bremen 2008; Meier 2012, 342–353.

72 The inscription in question is SEG XXXIII, 1039, ll. 27–29: “[...] στήσαι δὲ τὴν εἰκόνα τὴν χρυσὴν ἐπὶ στυλίδος | μαρμαρίνης ἐν τῷ περιβόλῳ τοῦ βουλευτηρίου ᾧ ἀνατέθεικεν Ἀρχίππη | ἐπὶ | γραφὴν ἔχουσαν [...]”.

73 Savalli-Lestrade 1993, 242–246, 266.

74 Parra 2006, 109.

75 The possible derivation from the *bouleuterion* of Miletus is also suggested by Bremen 2008, 371–372.

76 Parra 2006, 108.

77 Laviosa 1995, 83; Berti 2011, 300.

78 The identification of the two buildings with the local *ekklesiasterion* and *bouleuterion* was first suggested by Gheorghios Oikonomos, Oikonomos 1909, and has been more recently supported by Petros Themelis, Themelis 2004, 69–73. Contra Hellmann 2013, 174. For an up-to-date analysis of the archaeological remains of the *Asklepieion* and a revision of the interpretations concerning these two buildings see Emme 2013, 39–49, 340–341; Sielhorst 2015, 100–105, 251–253.




Fig. 9 Plan of the *bouleuterion*/*prytaneion* complex of Priene.




Fig. 10 Plan of the northwestern side of the *agora* of Megalopolis.

If we move to the archaeological evidence, we would like to add a couple of further possible examples of such an architectural complex, composed of *bouleuterion* and buildings articulated around a central columned court. The first example we would like to recall is the one composed of the *bouleuterion* and the so-called *prytaneion*, in the northeastern corner of the *agora* of Priene (Fig. 9).⁷⁹ Although not in direct communication with one another, the two buildings can be considered as part of a harmonious complex. In this sense, a crucial role is without doubt played by the huge ‘North *stoa*’. This building not only defines the northern side of the *agora*, but also contributes to linking all the different structures of this side of the square (i.e. the square rooms on the western half of the portico and the *bouleuterion*/*prytaneion* complex on the eastern half), shaping a coherent and homogeneous whole.

A second interesting example of such a planimetric

composition is in the western side of the *agora* of Megalopolis (Fig. 10).⁸⁰ Here, south of the *bouleuterion* occupying the northwestern corner of the public square, a building composed of six ‘Dreiraumgruppen’ units, is set up around a central columned court. For the sake of clarity, it is necessary to say that, in terms of plan, the *bouleuterion* of Megalopolis is totally different from that of Segesta,⁸¹ and there are no traces of a portico or a *stoa* creating a common façade toward the *agora*, as we have in fact seen in the cases of Segesta, Iaitas and Priene. Despite this, it seems to us that the physical and functional relation between the two buildings of Megalopolis cannot be underestimated. While there is no doubt about the identification of the Council House, not the same can be said of the other building, though it has been generally identified with the town *prytaneion* or *damiorgion*.⁸² Whether we accept one term or the other, or even Lauter’s more articulated designation of ‘*demosia*

79 On the *agora* of Priene see Sielhorst 2015, 108–115, 266–271 with previous literature. On the *prytaneion* of Priene see also Miller 1978, 117–127.

80 For a complete study of the political buildings on the western side of the *agora* of Megalopolis see Lauter-Bufe and Lauter 2011. See also Osanna 2003; Emme 2013, 89–92, 340; Sielhorst 2015, 96–100, 246–250.

81 The *bouleuterion* of Megalopolis is indeed planimetrically and architecturally comparable to a different kind of Council House, more similar to

‘hypostyle halls’ such as the *bouleuterion* of Assos, Arslan and Eren 2012, and the above-mentioned ‘T building’ at Messene, rather than to that of Miletus.

82 The identification was already suggested by Lauter 2005, 238. See also Lauter-Bufe and Lauter 2011, 77–79. Contra: Hellmann 2013, 174. For an up-to-date analysis, with previous literature, see Emme 2013, 91; Sielhorst 2015, 248.

oikia, we perfectly agree with him in understanding the sequence of buildings on the western side of the *agora* of Megalopolis as an ensemble of structures serving the civic and political life of the town.

5 Conclusions

Our reconsideration of the Segestan dossier does not overcome the basic difficulty represented by a lacunose archaeological and epigraphic documentation. Indeed, it aims at focusing our attention on the need not to force the meaning and interpretation of fragmentary data in order to create univocal connections between different kinds of sources.

Thus, on the basis of the re-examination of the epigraphic and archaeological data, we question the hypothesis of a *gymnasion* at Segesta and, above all, its identification with the peristyle building near the *bouleuterion*.

At first glance, the dedication to the gymnasiarch Artemon son of Aleidas (IGDSII, no. 85) is the only element possibly demonstrating that Segesta had its own *gymnasion*.⁸³ Unfortunately, this does not allow us to automatically identify where the building devoted to the gymnasial activities was set up. Besides, we do not aim at investigating here the role played by the *gymnasion* and the γυμνασίαρχος in the Hellenistic World and, more specifically speaking, in Sicily.⁸⁴ Still, it cannot be underestimated that, especially since the late Hellenistic period and the Roman conquest, the role of the *gymnasion* and the γυμνασίαρχος seems to have been increasingly linked with the military activity of cities.⁸⁵ Not surprisingly, Philippe Gauthier described the *gymnasion* as: “servant d’abord à la formation du citoyen-soldat, là où substituait une armée civique”.⁸⁶ As far as Sicily is con-

cerned, such a close relationship between military and gymnasial activities is well-demonstrated by an inscription from Solunto which records a dedication to the γυμνασίαρχος Antallos Ornicas by three units of infantry (τάξεις τρεῖς), in association with the ephebes.⁸⁷ Remarkably, for Solunto epigraphic and archaeological evidence were also correlated, leading to the initial identification of the *gymnasion* with a building on the so-called Via dell’*agora* (the so-called Ginnasio).⁸⁸ Although the interpretation of this structure as the local *gymnasion* was first stimulated by the discovery of the γυμνασίαρχος inscription near the building, the presence of a columned courtyard provided a key feature for this identification, similar to the case in Segesta. More recently, the Soluntine ‘Ginnasio’ has been correctly identified as the house of a wealthy local notable.⁸⁹ The actual *gymnasion* of Soluntum has been correctly identified in a peristyle building next to the theater.⁹⁰

Both the examples from Segesta and Soluntum show in fact how in the case of the *gymnasion* different sources must be separately examined and their possible connection carefully assessed. Even if one would expect a separate *gymnasion* building in a monumentalized city center like that of late Hellenistic Segesta, the presence of a γυμνασίαρχος was not necessarily connected to a specific and actual building within the urban area. This seems to be true for the Roman period, especially in the eastern Mediterranean,⁹¹ and suggests that the equation γυμνασιάρχια = *gymnasion* (understood as a specific building within the urban context) should be critically revised. This has already been observed by Delorme:

[...] magistrat et monument ne sont pas indissolublement unis. A vrai dire, le cas inverse, c’est-à-dire l’existence de la fonction sans l’édifice serait plus convaincant encore. [...]

83 As we have already noticed, a further epigraphic element supporting the thesis of the Segestan *gymnasion* might be represented by a still unpublished inscription, possibly of an ephebic nature: see above.

84 In addition to Delorme’s still valid overview on the Greek *gymnasion*, Delorme 1960, we want to recall Philippe Gauthier’s and Henner von Hesberg’s considerations on the gymnasial institution and the corresponding magistrates and buildings; Gauthier 1995; von Hesberg 1995. More recently, these issues have been investigated by Ralf von den Hoff (von den Hoff 2009), and in several contributions to the volume Kah and Scholz 2004. In particular, as far as the γυμνασιάρχια is concerned, see Schuler 2004. See also D. Kah in this volume. Finally, for the *gymnasion* and the gymnasial institution in Sicily, see Cordiano 1997, Prag 2007, Mango 2009, and M. Trümper in this volume.

85 Jonathan Prag has correctly noticed and carefully examined this peculiar

feature of the Sicilian *gymnasion* during the Hellenistic and especially the Roman period: Prag 2007.

86 Gauthier 1995, 10.

87 IG XIV, 311 = SEG XXXVIII, 964. Among others see: Manni Piraino 1973, 144–147; Cordiano 1997, 70–72.

88 The peristyle building was supposed to be the Soluntine *gymnasion* by Francesco Saverio Cavallari: Cavallari 1875, 3.

89 Wolf 2003, 3–52, resuming an identification proposed already by Salinas 1884, 25;

90 Cutroni Tusa et al. 1994, 77–79; Wiegand 1997, 26–28; Mango 2009, 763–764; Mistretta 2013; De Vincenzo 2013, 184–186; M. Trümper in this volume.

91 See M. Vitale in this volume.

Même si l'on ne consent pas à admettre cette explication, il n'en demeure pas moins certain [...] que l'existence du gymnasiarque ne peut suffire à garantir celle du monument.⁹²

Whether or not this was the case in Segesta, a hypothetical *gymnasion* must be reconstructed in a place different from the area of the *agora*. Indeed, the most recent archaeological investigations have shown that there is not enough space for such a building, neither on the upper terrace of the *agora* nor on the intermediate terrace. Alternatively, we might rather think of a structure in the area of the theater. This urban sector had its main architectural development in the Hellenistic period, when the theater was set up. While only further archaeological investigations will allow for a better planimetric definition of this area, this hypothesis would be supported by the possible provenance of the inscription IGDSII, no. 85 from this area. Furthermore, the connection of theater and *gymnasion* would find a good parallel in the city center of Solunto.

The suggested identification of the *palaestra* of the Segestan *gymnasion* with the peristyle building on the upper terrace of the *agora* must be rejected, once and for all. On the basis of the above mentioned *bouleuteria/prytaneia* complexes, a similar interpretation may be suggested for the complex in Segesta. The hypothetical presence of a *prytaneion* near the *bouleuterion* could explain the references to ἀνδρεῶνες in various inscriptions discussed here.⁹³ Still, basing a new interpretation solely on the rather generic feature of the peristyle courtyard

would be tricky, and indeed a repetition of questionable methodological procedures and hermeneutic attempts that we have criticized here.⁹⁴

Thus, instead of looking at a single architectural feature, we should better think of the topographic context and the proximity with other buildings. With such an approach, we can recognize the *bouleuterion*-peristyle complex on the upper terrace of the *agora* of Segesta as a functionally coherent ensemble and as a further strong demonstration of the Micro-Asiatic (and particularly Milesian) influences on Sicilian architecture and urban planning in the late Hellenistic period.

5.1 Postscriptum

Only after the final submission of this paper we have had the chance to read a very recent and stimulating article by S. De Vido,⁹⁵ in which the Segestan *hierophylakes* and the inscription IG XIV, 291 are thoroughly examined. Although the article is mainly devoted to an epigraphic analysis of this and other documents, the author suggests the possibility of identifying the περίστυλος near the Segestan *bouleuterion* with the local *prytaneion* due to its possible connection with the above-mentioned inscription. As already noticed, IG XIV, 291, as well as many of the documents with which De Vido deals, are unfortunately of unknown provenance. Still, the final remarks of De Vido's article could represent a further element supporting our hypothesis of a *bouleuterion/prytaneion* complex on the upper terrace of the *agora* of Segesta.

92 Delorme 1960, 5–6. The same idea was supported by Gauthier 1995, 6, no. 1. See also Campagna 2006, 31, and De Vincenzo 2013, 185.

93 IG XIV, 291; SEG XLI, 826, and IGDSII, no. 89.

94 As B. Emme has recently re-asserted, Emme 2013, 4–5, the peristyle had

several different functions: as a result, it used to represent a very versatile element that, similarly to the *stoa*, was adapted to the surrounding context.

95 De Vido 2016.



Pl. 1 General plan of the *agora* of Segesta.




Pl. 2 Aerial view of the *agora* of Segesta.




Pl. 3 Plan of the upper terrace of the *agora* of Segesta, i.e. the 'area of the *bouleuterion*'.



Pl. 4 Aerial view of the upper terrace of the *agora* of Segesta, i.e. the 'area of the *bouleuterion*'.



Pl. 5 Plan of the *bouleuterion* of Segesta.



Pl. 6 Digital Elevation Model (DEM) with contour lines of the upper terrace of the *agora* of Segesta.

Bibliography

Abata and Cannistraci 2012

Agata Abata and Oriana Silia Cannistraci. "La stoa Nord dell'agora di Segesta: alcune note preliminari sull'elevato architettonico dell'ala Ovest". In *Agora, foro e istituzioni politiche in Sicilia e nel Mediterraneo antico (Atti delle sette giornate internazionali di studi sull'area elima e la Sicilia occidentale nel contesto mediterraneo, Erice, 12-15 ottobre 2009)*. Ed. by C. Ampolo. Seminari e convegni 28. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2012, 305-319.

Abate and Cannistraci 2013

Agata Abate and Oriana Silia Cannistraci. "Segesta. Agora. Analisi architettonica dell'ingresso monumentale all'ambiente I della stoa Nord". *Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità comunicate dalla Scuola normale superiore di Pisa* S. 5.5.2 (2013), 29-48.

Abate and Giaccone 2014

Agata Abate and Nicola Giaccone. "Segesta. Agora. Stoa Nord. Ala Est". *Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità comunicate dalla Scuola normale superiore di Pisa* S. 5.6.2 (2014), 33-39.

Ampolo 2008

Carmine Ampolo. "L'iscrizione del ginnasio di Petelia (IG XIV, 637)". *Minima epigraphica et papyrologica* 13 (2008), 23-28.

Ampolo and Parra 2012

Carmine Ampolo and Maria Cecilia Parra. "L'agora di Segesta: uno sguardo d'insieme tra iscrizioni e monumenti". In *Agora, foro e istituzioni politiche in Sicilia e nel Mediterraneo antico (Atti delle sette giornate internazionali di studi sull'area elima e la Sicilia occidentale nel contesto mediterraneo, Erice, 12-15 ottobre 2009)*. Ed. by C. Ampolo. Seminari e convegni 28. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2012, 272-285.

Ampolo and Parra 2016

Carmine Ampolo and Maria Cecilia Parra. "Scavi nell'area dell'agora (2014-2015): risultati e prospettive di ricerca". *Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità comunicate dalla Scuola normale superiore di Pisa* S. 5.8.2 (2016), 3-8.

Arslan and Eren 2012

Nurretin Arslan and Kenan Eren. "L'agora d'Assos: le plan, la construction et les différentes phases de son utilisation". In *Basiliques et agoras de Grèce et d'Asie mineure*. Ed. by L. Cavalier, R. Descat, and J. des Courtis. Mémoires 27. Bordeaux: Ausonius, 2012, 273-286.

Balty 1991

Jean Charles Balty. *Curia ordinis: recherches d'architecture et d'urbanisme antiques sur les curies provinciales du monde romain*. Mémoires de la Classe des beaux-arts Collection 4, 2. série, t. 15, fasc. 2. Brussels: Académie royale de Belgique, 1991.

Benelli et al. 1995

Maria Vittoria Benelli, Monica De Cesare, Maurizio Paoletti, and Maria Cecilia Parra. "Lo scavo dell'Area 3000 (SAS 3)". *Annali della Scuola normale superiore di Pisa* III. XXV. 3 (1995), 662-755.

Berti 2011

Fede Berti. "L'agora di Iasos alla luce delle più recenti scoperte". In *Labraunda and Karia. Proceedings of the International Symposium Commemorating Sixty Years of Swedish Archaeological Work in Labraunda. The Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities Stockholm, November 20-21, 2008*. Ed. by L. Karlsson and S. Carlsson. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Boreas 32. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2011, 291-305.

Bremen 2008

Riet van Bremen. "The Date and Context of the Kymaian Decrees for Archippè (SEG 33 1035-1041)". *Revue des études anciennes* 110.2 (2008), 357-382.

Campagna 2006

Lorenzo Campagna. "L'architettura di età ellenistica in Sicilia: per una rilettura del quadro generale". In *Sicilia ellenistica, Consuetudo italica. Alle origini dell'architettura ellenistica*. Ed. by M. Osanna and M. Torelli. Biblioteca di 'Sicilia antiqua' 1. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 2006, 15-34.

Campagna 2007

Lorenzo Campagna. "Architettura pubblica ed evergetismo nella Sicilia di età repubblicana". In *La Sicilia romana tra Repubblica e Alto Impero. Atti del Convegno di Studi (Caltanissetta, 20-21 maggio 2006)*. Ed. by C. Micciché, S. Modeo, and L. Santagati. Caltanissetta: Sicilantica, 2007, 110-134.

Cannistraci and Perna 2012

Oriana Silia Cannistraci and Marianna Perna. "Segesta. Agora. Settore NordEst". *Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità comunicate dalla Scuola normale superiore di Pisa* S. 5.4.2 (2012), 12-16.

Cannistraci and Perna 2013

Oriana Silia Cannistraci and Marianna Perna. "Segesta. Agora. Settore NordEst". *Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità comunicate dalla Scuola normale superiore di Pisa* S. 5.5.2 (2013), 15-20.

Cavallari 1875

Francesco Saverio Cavallari. "Scavi e scoperte. Posizione topografica di Solunto". *Bullettino della Commissione di Antichità e Belle Arti* VIII (1875), 1-9.

Cordiano 1997

Giuseppe Cordiano. *La Ginnasiarchia nelle 'poleis' dell'Occidente Mediterraneo Antico*. Studi e testi di storia antica 7. Pisa: ETS, 1997.

Cutroni Tusa et al. 1994

Aldina Cutroni Tusa, Antonella Italia, Daniela Lima, and Vincenzo Tusa. *Solunto*. Itinerari (Ministero per i beni culturali e ambientali, Comitato nazionale per gli studi e le ricerche sulla civiltà fenicia e punica) 15. Rome: Libreria dello Stato, Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca, 1994.

De Cesare and Parra 2000

Monica De Cesare and Maria Cecilia Parra. "Il bouleuterio di Segesta: primi dati per una definizione del monumento nel contesto urbanistico di età ellenistica". In *Atti delle terze giornate internazionali di studi sull'area elima (Gibellina – Erice – Contessa Entellina, 23–26 ottobre 1997)*. Pisa and Gibellina: Scuola normale superiore, 2000, 273–286.

De Vido 2016

Stefania De Vido. "Hierophylakes a Segesta. Un'interpretazione di IG XIV 291". In *Ἡμετέρα γράμματα Scritti di epigrafia greca offerti a Teresa Alfieri Tonini*. Ed. by S. Strufofolino. Aristonothos. Scritti per il Mediterraneo antico 12. Milano: Ledizioni, 2016, 227–248.

De Vincenzo 2013

Salvatore De Vincenzo. *Tra Cartagine e Roma. I centri urbani dell'eparchia punica di Sicilia tra VI e I Sec. a.C.* Topoi 8. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2013.

Delorme 1960

Jean Delorme. *Gymnasion. Études sur les monuments consacrés à l'éducation en Grèce (des origines à l'Empire Romain)*. Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome Fasc. 196. Paris: De Boccard, 1960.

Emme 2013

Burkhard Emme. *Peristyl und Polis: Entwicklung und Funktionen öffentlicher griechischer Hofanlagen*. Urban Spaces Bd. 1. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2013.

Erdas and Gagliardi 2003

Donatella Erdas and Vanessa Gagliardi. "Segesta. Settori occidentale e settentrionale dell'agora". *Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità comunicate dalla Scuola normale superiore di Pisa* S. 4.VIII.1–2 (2003), 417–430.

Facella and Olivito 2012

Antonino Facella and Riccardo Olivito. "Agora di Segesta. L'area della stoa sudoccidentale". In *Agora, foro e istituzioni politiche in Sicilia e nel Mediterraneo antico (Atti delle settime giornate internazionali di studi sull'area elima e la Sicilia occidentale nel contesto mediterraneo, Erice, 12–15 ottobre 2009)*. Ed. by C. Ampolo. Seminari e convegni 28. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2012, 291–304.

Facella and Olivito 2013

Antonino Facella and Riccardo Olivito. "Segesta. Agora. Area della Stoa Nord (SAS 4; 2012)". *Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità comunicate dalla Scuola normale superiore di Pisa* S. 5.5.2 (2013), 10–14.

Gauthier 1995

Philippe Gauthier. "Notes sur le rôle du gymnase dans les cités hellénistiques". In *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus : Kolloquium, München, 24. bis 26. Juni 1993*. Ed. by W. Wörle and P. Zanker. Vestigia 47. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995, 1–10.

GDI

Hermann Collitz and Friedrich Bechtel, eds. *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1884–1915.

Gneisz 1990

Doris Gneisz. *Das antike Rathaus: das griechische Bouleuterion und die frühromische Curia*. Dissertationen der Universität Wien 205. Vienna: VWGÖ, 1990.

Gualtherus 1624

Georgius Gualtherus. *Siciliae obiacentium insularum et Bruttiorum antiquae tabulae cum animaduersionibus*. Messanae: Apud Petrum Bream, 1624.

Hamon 2005

Patrice Hamon. "Rites et sacrifices célébrés dans le conseil. Remarques sur les cultes du bouleuterion et leur évolution à l'époque hellénistique". *Topoi* 12–13.1 (2005), 315–332.

Hansen and Fischer-Hansen 1994

Mogens Herman Hansen and Tobias Fischer-Hansen. "Monumental Political Architecture in Archaic and Classical Greek Poleis. Evidence and Historical Significance". In *From Political Architecture to Stephanus Byzantius*. Ed. by D. Whitehead. Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 1, Historia, Einzelschriften 87. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1994, 23–90.

Hellmann 2013

Marie-Christine Hellmann. "Review of Lauter-Bufe, Heide, Lauter Hans, Die politischen Bauten von Megalopolis, 2011, Darmstadt and Mainz, Philipp von Zabern". *Revue archéologique* 55.1 (2013), 171–174.

von Hesberg 1995

Henner von Hesberg. "Das griechische Gymnasion im 2. Jh. v. Chr.". In *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus : Kolloquium, München, 24. bis 26. Juni 1993*. Ed. by M. Wörle and P. Zanker. Vestigia 47. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995, 1–27.

von den Hoff 2009

Ralf von den Hoff. "Hellenistische Gymnasia: Raumgestaltung und Raumfunktionen". In *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus*. Ed. by A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann. Hellenistische Polis als Lebensform 1. Berlin: Verlag Antike, 2009, 245–275.

IGDS

Laurent Dubois, ed. *Inscriptions grecques dialectales de Sicile: contribution à l'étude du vocabulaire grec colonial*. Collection de l'Ecole française de Rome 119. Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1989.

IGDSII

Laurent Dubois, ed. *Inscriptions grecques dialectales de Sicile, II*. Sciences historiques et philologiques 3. Genève: Droz, 2008.

IGSK

Helmut Engelmann. *Die Inschriften von Kyme*. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 5. Bonn: Habelt, 1976.

Isler 2003

Hans Peter Isler. "Bouleuteria di Sicilia". In *Archeologia del Mediterraneo. Studi in onore di Ernesto De Miro*. Ed. by G. Fiorentini, M. Caccamo Caltabiano, and A. Calderone. 34. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2003, 429–433.

Isler 2011

Hans Peter Isler. "La data di costruzione dell'agorà e di altri monumenti architettonici di Iaitas. Un contributo alla cronologia dell'architettura ellenistica della Sicilia Occidentale". *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Antiquité* 123.1 (2011), 107–144.

Isler 2012

Hans Peter Isler. "L'agorà ellenistica di Iaitas". In *Agora, foro e istituzioni politiche in Sicilia e nel Mediterraneo antico (Atti delle sette giornate internazionali di studi sull'area elima e la Sicilia occidentale nel contesto mediterraneo, Erice, 12–15 ottobre 2009)*. Ed. by C. Ampolo. Seminari e convegni 28. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2012, 229–237.

Johannowsky 1994

Werner Johannowsky. "Osservazioni sul bouleuterion di Iasos". *Ostraka* III.2 (1994), 451–454.

Kah and Scholz 2004

Daniel Kah and Peter Scholz. *Das Hellenistische Gymnasium*. Wissenschaft und gesellschaftlicher Wandel 8. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004.

Knackfuss 1908

Hubert Knackfuss. *Das Rathaus von Milet*. Berlin: Reimer, 1908.

Kockel 1995

Valentin Kockel. "Bouleuteria. Architektonische Form und urbanistischer Kontext". In *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus: Kolloquium, München, 24. bis 26. Juni 1993*. Ed. by M. Wörle and P. Zanker. Vestigia 47. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995, 29–40.

Lanérès 2008

Nicole Lanérès. "Irénes et Tritirènes, réflexions sur la vocabulaire laconien de l'Ephébie". *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* LXXXII.2 (2008), 293–304.

Lauter 1986

Hans Lauter. *Die Architektur des Hellenismus*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1986.

Lauter 2005

Hans Lauter. "Megalopolis. Ausgrabungen auf der Agora, 1991–2002". In *Ancient Arcadia. Papers from the Third International Seminar on ancient Arcadia held at the Norwegian Institute at Athens, 7–10 May 2002*. Ed. by E. Østby. Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens 8. Athens: Norwegian Institute at Athens, 2005, 235–248.

Lauter-Bufe and Lauter 2011

Heide Lauter-Bufe and Hans Lauter. *Die politischen Bauten von Megalopolis*. Darmstadt and Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2011.

Laviosa 1995

Clelia Laviosa. "Iasos". In *Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica, classica e orientale*, 2° Suppl., 1971–1994. III. Rome: Istituto della enciclopedia italiana, 1995, 76–88.

Lavrencic 1988

Monica Lavrencic. "Ἀγδορεῖον". *Tyche* 3 (1988), 147–161.

Manganaro 1980

Giacomo Manganaro. "La provincia romana". In *La Sicilia antica*. II, 2. Ed. by E. Gabba and G. Vallet. Naples: Società Editrice Storia di Napoli, del Mezzogiorno continentale e della Sicilia, 1980, 411–461.

Manganaro 1999

Giacomo Manganaro. *Sikelika. Studi di antichità e di epigrafia della Sicilia greca*. Vol. 8. Biblioteca di Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica. Pisa and Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 1999.

Mango 2009

Elena Mango. "Il ginnasio in Sicilia: un caso particolare?". In *Immagine e immagini della Sicilia e delle altre isole del Mediterraneo antico. Atti delle Sette Giornate Internazionali di Studi sull'area elima e la Sicilia occidentale nel contesto mediterraneo, Erice, 12–16 ottobre 2006*. Ed. by C. Ampolo. Seminari e convegni 22. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2009, 763–772.

Manni Piraino 1973

Maria Teresa Manni Piraino. *Iscrizioni greche lapidarie del Museo di Palermo*. Sikelika. Serie storica. Palermo: Flaccovio, 1973.

Marconi 1931

Pirro Marconi. "Segesta (Trapani). Scoperte varie (necropoli tarda, iscrizione greca, giacimento preistorico)". *Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità* IX (1931), 397–400.

Martin 1951

Roland Martin. *Recherches sur l'agora grecque. Études d'histoire et d'architecture urbaines*. Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 174. Paris: De Boccard, 1951.

McDonald 1943

William Andrew McDonald. *The Political Meeting Places of the Greeks*. Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology 34. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1943.

Meier 2012

Ludwig Meier. *Die Finanzierung öffentlicher Bauten in der hellenistischen Polis*. Hellenistische Polis als Lebensform 3. Mainz: Verlag der Antike, 2012.

Michellini 1997

Chiara Michellini. "Le agorai di ambiente coloniale e il caso di Segesta". In *Atti delle seconde giornate internazionali di studi sull'area elima (Gibellina, 22–26 ottobre 1994)*. Pisa and Gibellina: Scuola normale superiore, 1997, 1139–1158.

Miller 1978

Stephen Gaylord Miller. *The Prytaneion Its Function and Architectural Form*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1978.

Mistretta 2013

Alessia Mistretta. "Dalla paradromis all'agorà-ginnasio di Solunto. Componenti architettoniche e sintassi topografico-urbanistica". *Mare Internum: archeologia e culture del Mediterraneo* 5 (2013), 101–119.

Nenci 1991

Giuseppe Nenci. "Florilegio epigrafico segestano". *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di Lettere e Filosofia*. Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore S. III.XXI.3–4 (1991), 920–929.

Nenci 2000

Giuseppe Nenci. "Varia elyma: novità epigrafiche, numismatiche, toponomastiche e culturali dall'area elima". In *Atti delle terze giornate internazionali di studi sull'area elima (Gibellina – Erice – Contessa Entellina, 23–26 ottobre 1997)*. Pisa and Gibelina: Scuola normale superiore, 2000, 809–821.

Oehler 1912

Johann Oehler. "Gymnasium". *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* VII (1912), 2004–2026.

Oikonomos 1909

Georgios Oikonomos. "Ἀνασκάφαι ἐν Μεσσήνῃ". *Prakt* (1909), 201–205.

Olivito 2014a

Riccardo Olivito. "Dynamics of 'Romanization' in the Agora of Segesta: the Case of the Macellum". In *Centre and Periphery in the Ancient World. Proceedings of the XVIIIth International Congress of Classical Archaeology*. Ed. by J. M. Álvarez, T. B. Nogales, and I. d. L. Rodà. Mérida: Museo Nacional de Arte Romano, 2014, 1507–1511.

Olivito 2014b

Riccardo Olivito. "Segesta. Area della strada (SAS 3, 2013)". *Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità comunicate dalla Scuola normale superiore di Pisa* S. 5.6.2 (2014), 11–17.

Olivito 2017 [2018]

Riccardo Olivito. "Il settore meridionale dell'agora/forum di Segesta: un esempio di compromesso tra pianificazione urbanistica, gestione della viabilità ed esigenza commerciali". *Atti e Memorie della Società Magna Grecia Serie V II* (2017 [2018]), 235–274.

Olivito and Serra 2014

Riccardo Olivito and Alfonsa Serra. "Segesta. Agora. Stoa Nord. Settore centrale (SAS 4, 2013)". *Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità comunicate dalla Scuola normale superiore di Pisa* S. 5.6.2 (2014), 18–22.

Osanna 2003

Massimo Osanna. "L'agora di Megalopoli vista da Pausania: alla ricerca del tempo perduto in una città sinecizzata". *Siris* 4 (2003), 15–22.

Parapetti 1985

Roberto Parapetti. "Il bouleuterion: aspetti architettonici e decorativi". In *Studi su Iasos di Caria. Venticinque anni di scavi della Missione Archeologica Italiana*. Ed. by AA.VV. Bollettino d'arte. Supplemento 31–32. Rome: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 1985, 105–136.

Parra 1997

Maria Cecilia Parra. "Segesta. Uso e reimpiego della città greco-romana in forme architettoniche ed edilizie di Calatabarbo". In *Akten / Forschungstagung zum Thema Wohnbauforschung in Zentral- und Westsizilien (Zürich, 28. Februar–3. März 1996); fünfundzwanzig Jahre Zürcher Ausgrabungen auf dem Monte Iato = Atti / Giornate di studio sul tema Sicilia Occidentale e Centro-Meridionale: Ricerche Archeologiche nell'Abitato*. Ed. by H. P. Isler. Zürich: Archäologisches Institut der Universität Zürich, 1997, 141–150.

Parra 2006

Maria Cecilia Parra. "Note di architettura ellenistica a Segesta, intorno all'agora". In *Sicilia ellenistica, Consuetudo italica. Alle origini dell'architettura ellenistica d'occidente. Atti del convegno di Spoleto, 5–7 Novembre 2004*. Ed. by M. Osanna and M. Torelli. Biblioteca di 'Sicilia antiqua' 1. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 2006, 107–122.

Perlman 2014

Paula Perlman. "Reading and Writing Archaic Cretan Society". In *Cultural Practices and Material Culture in Archaic and Classical Crete. Proceedings of the International Conference, Mainz, May 20–21, 2011*. Ed. by O. Pilz and G. Seelentag. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014, 177–206.

Perna 2016

Marianna Perna. "Agora. Stoa Nord. Ala Est. Ambiente alpha (SAS 4, 2015)". *Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità comunicate dalla Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* s. 5, 8, 2 (2016), 30–36.

Prag 2007

Jonathan Prag. "Auxilia and Gymnasia: A Sicilian Model of Roman Imperialism". *The Journal of Roman Studies* 97 (2007), 68–100.

Raoul Rochette 1836

Désiré Raoul Rochette. "Lettre à M. Welcker, Sur quelques inscriptions grecques de la Sicile". *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 4 (1836), 63–98.

Salinas 1884

Antonio Salinas. *Solunto. Ricordi storici e archeologici*. Palermo: Tipografia dello "Statuto", 1884.

Savalli-Lestrade 1993

Ivana Savalli-Lestrade. "Archippe di Kyme, la benefattrice". In *Grecia al femminile*. Ed. by N. Loraux. Storia e società. Bari e Rome: Laterza, 1993, 229–273.

Schaaf 1992

Hildegard Schaaf. *Untersuchungen zu Gebäudestiftungen in hellenistischer Zeit. Arbeiten zur Archäologie*. Cologne: Böhlau, 1992.

Schuler 2004

Christof Schuler. "Die Gymnasiarchie in hellenistischer Zeit". In *Das Hellenistische Gymnasium*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel 8. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 163–192.

Sielhorst 2015

Barbara Sielhorst. *Hellenistische Agorai: Gestaltung, Rezeption und Semantik eines urbanen Raumes*. Urban Spaces 3. Berlin and Munich: De Gruyter, 2015.

Themelis 2004

Petros Themelis. *Antica Messene*. Athens: Ministry of Culture, Archaeological Receipts, 2004.

Tigano 2012

Gabriella Tigano. "Alesa Arconidea: l'agora/foro". In *Agora, foro e istituzioni politiche in Sicilia e nel Mediterraneo antico (Atti delle settime giornate internazionali di studi sull'area elima e la Sicilia occidentale nel contesto mediterraneo, Erice, 12-15 ottobre 2009)*. Ed. by C. Ampolo. Seminari e convegni 28. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2012, 133-154.

Tuchelt 1975

Klaus Tuchelt. "Buleuterion und Ara Augusti. Bemerkungen zur Rathauslage von Milet". *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 25 (1975), 91-140.

Wiegand 1997

Armin Wiegand. *Das Theater von Solunt. Ein besonderer Skentyp des Späthellenismus auf Sizilien*. Sonderschriften des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Rom 12. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1997.

Wolf 2003

Markus Wolf. *Die Häuser von Solunt und die hellenistische Wohnarchitektur*. Sonderschriften des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Rom 14. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2003.

Wolf 2013

Markus Wolf. *Die Agora von Solunt. Öffentliche Gebäude und öffentliche Räume des Hellenismus im griechischen Westen*. Sonderschriften des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Rom 16. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2013.

Illustration and plate credits

ILLUSTRATIONS: 1-2 E. Taccola. 3 Scuola Normale Superiore. 6 Ampolo and Parra 2012, fig. 323. 7 Emme 2013, 460 pl. 72. 8 Isler 2012, fig. 240. 9 Emme 2013, 482 pl. 84. 10 Emme 2013, 446 pl. 58b. **PLATES:** 1 Plan by C.

Cassanelli, Scuola Normale Superiore. 2 Scuola Normale Superiore. 3 Plan by C. Cassanelli, Scuola Normale Superiore. 4 E. Taccola. 5 Plan by C. Cassanelli, Scuola Normale Superiore. 6 E. Taccola.

ORIANA SILIA CANNISTRACI

M. A. (Pisa 2006), Postgraduate Diploma (Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene 2010), currently Ph. D. candidate (Scuola Normale Superiore Pisa). Her scientific interests focus on public spaces and buildings in the Hellenistic world, with an interdisciplinary approach involving architecture, literary and epigraphic sources, and socio-anthropologic aspects. She has been supervising the archaeological investigations in the agora of Segesta for more than ten years.

Oriana Silia Cannistraci
Scuola Normale Superiore
Piazza dei Cavalieri, 7
56126 Pisa, Italy
E-Mail: oriana.cannistraci@sns.it

RICCARDO OLIVITO

M. A. 2008 (Pisa 2008), Ph. D. (Scuola Normale Superiore Pisa 2012). His research concerns planning and socio-economic aspects of Greek and Roman public spaces, public and domestic architecture at Pompeii; more recently, he has focused on Digital- and Cyber-Archaeology, with special attention to the perception and visualization of images in the Ancient World. He has been supervising the archaeological investigations in the agora of Segesta for more than ten years.

Dr. Riccardo Olivito
IMT - School for Advanced Studies, Lucca
Piazza San Ponziano, 6
55100 Lucca, Italy
E-Mail: riccardo.olivito@imtlucca.it

Monika Trümper

Gymnasia in Eastern Sicily of the Hellenistic and Roman Period

Summary

According to literary and epigraphic sources, the institution of the gymnasium thrived in Sicily from the 3rd century BC onwards, in the realm of Hieron II as well as in the Late Republican Roman province. This paper critically discusses whether the boom of the gymnasium is also reflected in the archaeological record and the emergence of a clearly discernible building typology. Focusing on five cities of Hieron's realm in eastern Sicily (Syracuse, Morgantina, Megara Hyblaea, Neaiton, and Akrai), it is examined whether gymnasia can be safely identified, what plan, decoration, and function they had, and whether changes between the 3rd century BC and later periods can be observed. It is shown that none of these cities provides evidence of a securely identifiable, fully known gymnasium, however.

Keywords: gymnasium; palaistra; Syracuse; Morgantina; Megara Hyblaea; Neaiton; Akrai

Schriftquellen und Inschriften legen nahe, dass in Sizilien die Institution des Gymnasiums vom 3. Jh. v. Chr. an florierte, im Reich Hierons II. wie auch in der spätrepublikanischen römischen Provinz. Dieser Beitrag untersucht kritisch, ob sich dieser Boom im archäologischen Befund und in der Entstehung einer eindeutig erkennbaren Bautypologie widerspiegelt. Am Beispiel von fünf ostsizilischen Städten in Hierons Reich (Syrakus, Morgantina, Megara Hyblaea, Neaiton, Akrai) wird untersucht, ob Gymnasia sicher identifiziert werden können, welchen Grundriss sowie welche Ausstattung und Funktion sie hatten, und ob es Änderungen zwischen dem 3. Jh. und späteren Epochen gab. Es wird gezeigt, dass bislang keine dieser Städte ein sicher identifiziertes und vollständig bekanntes Gymnasium aufweist.

Keywords: Gymnasium; Palaistra; Syrakus; Morgantina; Megara Hyblaea; Neaiton; Akrai

According to literary and epigraphic sources, the institution of the gymnasium thrived in Sicily from the 3rd century BC onwards at the latest. Based on this evidence, scholars formulated two hypotheses: first, that King Hieron II of Syracuse systematically promoted the gymnasium in the cities of his realm for strategic-military purposes, in order to train loyal, competent citizen-soldiers; and second, that “Roman rule in Sicily entailed the continuity, indeed the encouragement of traditional norms, in the form of local military activities and their institutional concomitants, in particular the gymnasium”.¹ Consequently, the importance of the gymnasium should be reflected in the archaeological record, both in quantity and typology: one could expect to find a functional standard type, developed and systematically propagated under Hieron and then adopted by the Roman rulers, a kind of model kit gymnasium. Accordingly, J. Prag recently assumed that all 65 cities of Late Republican Sicily provided a gymnasium.² With view to the astonishingly scarce archaeological remains of gymnasia, L. Campagna argued, however, that the epigraphic evidence of gymnasiarchs would not necessarily require corresponding monumental built complexes. The office of the gymnasiarch may have been “più genericamente onorifico e liturgico e meno connesso con gli aspetti specifici del training atletico e militare.”³ Gymnasium structures could have been simple, lacking a distinct architectural design that makes them safely identifiable today. A clearly recognizable building type ‘gymnasium’ (or palaestra) may only have been introduced during the monumental restyling of Sicilian cities in the late Hellenistic period.

It is the aim of this paper to critically discuss

whether the archaeological evidence of gymnasia in Sicily supports these assumptions, focusing on the following questions: Where and how can gymnasia be safely identified; where (cities/urban context), when and by whom were they built, what did they look like (size/plan/decoration), and what was their function; can significant changes be observed, e.g. between the period of Hieron’s reign in the 3rd century BC and later periods, notably the 2nd and 1st centuries BC? And finally, what do gymnasia contribute to the current vivid debate about the urban and cultural development of Hellenistic Sicily?

While the archaeological evidence of gymnasia in Sicily recently received some attention in scholarship, important remains are still unpublished and a comprehensive study is missing, so far.⁴ This gap can certainly not be filled here. Instead, complementing E. Mango’s recent assessment of gymnasia in western Sicily,⁵ focus is here on gymnasia in eastern Sicily, more particularly even those in Hieron’s realm. Space allows only for a discussion of those cities where archaeological evidence of gymnasia has been identified and is still being debated. These include Syracuse, Morgantina, Megara Hyblaea, Neaiton, and Akrai. In contrast, sites such as Taormina, where identification of a gymnasium has already been convincingly refuted,⁶ and Cava d’Ispica where recently discovered evidence is not yet sufficiently published,⁷ will be omitted.

Discussion of the sites is mainly based on published literature and on visits to the sites. For easier reference and comparative overview, the main data of the discussed sites are summarized in a table (Tab. 1).⁸

1 Prag 2007, 69; cf. also Ferruti 2004; Cordiano 1997.

2 Prag 2007, 93.

3 Campagna 2006, 31.

4 Archaeological remains are discussed, in varying detail by Ferruti 2004; Lehmler 2005, 103, 119, 159–161; Campagna 2006, 29–31; Prag 2007; Fiorentini 2009; Mango 2009; Wilson 2013, 112; Mistretta 2013; A. Mistretta has submitted a PhD dissertation about Gymnasia in Sicily at the University of Hamburg in 2012, which is not yet published, however, and was not accessible to me.

5 Mango 2009.

6 Ferruti 2004, 198–203; Campagna 2006, 31.

7 Trigilla 2011, 100–101 briefly relates that archaeologists identified a newly discovered complex of several grottoes under the grotto of S. Maria as a gymnasium. These grottoes were excavated under the super-

vision of Annamaria Sammito and Vittorio Rizzone, who will provide full publication in the near future; meanwhile for a brief preliminary assessment, see Sammito and Fiorilla 2013, 212–214; Sammito and Rizzone 2014, fig. 8 pl. IX. I am very much indebted to Annamaria Sammito for showing these caves to me in April 2017, for generously sharing information and publications with me, and for inspiring discussions about this highly unusual site and monument. While there is compelling evidence for identifying the complex of caves as a gymnasium and while it provides an intriguing comparison to the complex in Noto, the remains of Cava d’Ispica cannot be discussed in any detail here.

8 For comparison, this table also includes the sites of Tauromenion/Taormina and Solunto, but not the yet unpublished example in Cava d’Ispica.

Site	Epigraphic evidence	Literary evidence	Palaistra / Rooms	Paradromis/ Race track	Bathing facilities / Water supply	Size	Date
Akraí	x, 2nd half of 2nd c BC	-	x, courtyard with at least one portico or probably peristyle courtyard with rooms on at least one side	Unknown	Laconicum, 2 cisterns	Insula ca. 56×80 – 85 m = 4480 – 4760 m ² ?	2nd c BC? (typology only)
Megara Hyblaia	-	-	? courtyard with at least one portico and rooms on at least 2 sides	?, adjacent main street	Well	25×34 m = 850 m ²	3rd c BC or later? (no conclusive evidence)
Morgantina	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Neaiton/ Noto antica	x, 3rd c BC?	-	?, 5 rock cut rooms	?, on terrace	Cistern, channel system	Caves 1–3, 7–8 = ca. 100 m ² ; terrace $28 \times$ at least 80 m ² = at least 2240 m ²	3rd c BC? (inscription only)
Solunto	x, mid-1st c BC or AD?	-	x, peristyle courtyard surrounded by rooms on 3 sides	?, adjacent main street	Laconicum, cisterns	24×42 m = 1008 m ²	2nd c BC (relative chronology; built after the theater, over earlier residential structures)
Syracuse	?, fragmentary inscriptions of unknown date	For at least 3 different gymnasia, from 4th–1st c BC	1) ?, peristyle courtyard next to altar of Hieron 2) ?, 1st phase of “Roman gymnasium”, peristyle courtyard / quadriporticus	1) ?, integrated into area of altar/ “palais-tra” 2) unknown	1) Swimming pool 2) Unknown	1) Courtyard with porticoes $174 \times 40,90$ m = $7,117$ m ² 2) $76 \times$ c. 66 m = $5,016$ m ²	1) 2nd half of 3rd c BC or later? (architecture vs. stratigraphy) 2) Late Hellenistic (stratigraphy)
Taormenion/ Taormina	x, referring to 3rd c BC onwards (“tavole finanziarie”, not found in the peristyle building)	-	?, peristyle courtyard ($9,50 \times 7$ m), with rooms on at least one side, and at least 2 rooms on a higher terrace; one of these rooms (or entire building) = library according to painted stucco inscriptions	Unknown	2 cisterns (channel and conduits possibly outside the building)	Peristyle section c. 24×17 m = 408 m ² ; upper terrace c. $22 \times 13,5$ m = 297 m ² ; total = at least 705 m ²	Hellenistic (3rd c BC according to stucco inscriptions?)

Tab. 1 Sites in Sicily with identified gymnasia/palaistraí (x = securely identified; ? identification questionable and debated).

While the terminology of structures for athletic and educational activities is debated, the generally accepted identification is followed here: confined buildings with a courtyard and rooms are referred to as palaestrai, complexes that include space and structures for running are called gymnasia.

1 Syracuse

Literary sources suggest that Syracuse was provided with different gymnasia that were built from the 4th century BC onwards.⁹ Dionysios the Older built large gymnasia in the 4th century BC close to the Anapos River that flowed into the southwest end of the great harbor.¹⁰ Another gymnasium was constructed at the end of the 4th century BC around the tomb of Timoleon, close to the agora, in the Achradina quarter; this was called Timoleonteion.¹¹ A very large example, located, in the Tyche quarter, is mentioned by Cicero.¹² Finally, it is debated whether a Latin inscription of the Imperial period that almost certainly contains the word *gymnasium* really came from Syracuse. While J. R. A. Wilson was the first to contest a provenance from Syracuse, arguing that the inscription came from Rome via Noto to Syracuse, J. R. W. Prag recently ascribed this very inscription to Syracuse again.¹³ Several inscriptions referring to activi-

ties in gymnasia were found all over Syracuse and linked with the gymnasium in the Tyche quarter.¹⁴

Interestingly, none of the Syracusan gymnasia can safely be linked with the patronage of Hieron II, although he is particularly known as a builder of temples and gymnasia and famous for having greatly embellished the city of Syracuse.¹⁵

While now there is general agreement about where the various quarters of Hellenistic Syracuse were located (Pl. 1), correlation of the archaeological evidence with gymnasia known from textual sources is not possible and no gymnasium has been safely identified, so far.¹⁶ Three sites deserve brief discussion.

1. The site around the great altar of Hieron II that is located in the Neapolis has cautiously been identified as a palaestra, from 1954 onwards until recently.¹⁷ The altar (195.85 × 20.85 m) was bordered by a large square in the west (174 × 40.9 m) that was surrounded by Doric porticoes, which included a centrally placed Ionic propylon in the west (Fig. 1).

The square itself included a centrally placed large pool (27 × 12.75 m, ca. 1.3–1.8 m deep) that was provided with waterproof revetment, stairs in two corners, and a base in its center (0.9 × 1.7).¹⁸ Five parallel rows of cavities found in the open square were originally interpreted as evidence of trees.¹⁹ While the altar is safely dated to the Hieronian period, the ensemble of

9 Ferruti 2004, 205; cf. also Ernst 2015.

10 Diod. Sic. 15.13.5: really mentions the plural, gymnasia: κατεσκεύασε δὲ καὶ γυμνάσια μεγάλα παρὰ τὸν Ἄναπον ποταμὸν.

11 Plut. *Tim.* 39: ἐποιήσαντο δὲ τὴν ταφὴν τοῦ σώματος ἐν ἀγορᾷ, καὶ στοᾶς ὕστερον περιβαλόντες καὶ παλαίστρας ἐνοικοδομήσαντες γυμνάσιον τοῖς νέοις ἀνέκταν καὶ Τιμολεόντειον προσηγόρευσαν. Furthermore, they (the Syracusans, note of author) buried his (Timoleon's, note of author) ashes in the market place, and afterwards, when they had surrounded it with porticoes and built palastras in it, they set it apart as a gymnasium for their young men, and named it Timoleonteum (translation Perrin 1918). Cf. also Nep. *Timol.* 5.4; Polyae. 5.3.8.

12 Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.53 §119; Lehmler 2005, 98, 103.

13 CIL X, 7135; Wilson 1988; Prag 2007, 96 n. 164 without reference to Wilson 1988. This inscription was found in the so-called Roman gymnasium. Since Wilson provides a convincing detailed discussion, he is followed here.

14 Dimartino 2011, 94, following Manganaro 1999, lists five inscriptions (lists of youths, reference to competitions, dedication of a gymnasiarch's statue), but does not explain why these would have belonged to the gymnasium in the Tyche quarter and not one of the other gymnasia. Cf. also Dimartino 2011, 122. Cordiano 1997 did not list any evidence of gymnasiarchs in Syracuse. The inscriptions identified as references to gymnasia by Manganaro 1999, 67–69 nos. 57–62, are all very fragmentary and they cannot be safely reconstructed and dated. I am very grateful to Jonathan Prag for discussion of these inscriptions.

15 Athen. 5.206e: Ἱέρων δὲ ὁ Συρακοσίων βασιλεὺς, ὁ πάντα Ῥωμαίους

φίλος, ἐσπουδάκει μὲν καὶ περὶ ἱερῶν καὶ γυμνασίων κατασκευάς, ἦν δὲ καὶ περὶ ναυπηγίας φιλότιμος, πλοῖα σιτηγὰ κατασκευαζόμενος. "But Hieron, the king of Syracuse, he who was in all respects friendly to Rome, not only interested himself in the building of temples and gymnasia, but was also a zealous shipbuilder, constructing wheat-transports" (translation Gulick 2002). While this statement has often been related to Hieron's building activities in Syracuse, see e.g. Campagna 2004; Campagna 2006, 29, it is rather generic and does not explicitly mention the city; consequently, it is also cited as evidence of Hieron's cultural politics in his realm; e.g. Ferruti 2004, 191. Hieron's large ship, the Syrakosia, included a gymnasium; Athen. 5.206e–209e.

16 For reconstructed plans of Hellenistic Syracuse, see Lehmler 2005, 100 fig. 40; Mertens 2006, 311 fig. 567; Veit 2013, 30.

17 First by Gentili 1954, 353; palaestra for the juvenes and maybe even exercise venue for gladiators; resumed by Wilson 1990, 51–52, and Prag 2007, 89 n. 114.

18 While this pool is provided with one channel in its northwest corner, which served most likely as a supply channel (the level of its floor being about 0.60 m above the floor of the pool), no second channel (for drainage) has been found; this is nowhere commented upon; see, e.g., Parisi Presicce 2004; Wolf 2016, 40.

19 Gentili 1954, 354 mentions only several ditches whose function he could not explain. Stucchi 1954, 175 mentions five rows of trees. Neutsch 1954, 600–601 fig. 71, provides a plan with these five rows of cavities, including 140 in total.




Fig. 1 Syracuse, altar of Hieron II.

porticoes, pool, and trees was originally identified as an Augustan addition, based on finds.²⁰ According to G. V. Gentili, this very ensemble would have been reminiscent of the Augustan Great Palaestra in Pompeii and could have served similar purposes; however, he does not explain the rather strange combination with a monumental altar, which is missing in the Pompeian complex.²¹

Both the date of the ensemble and its configuration and function remain, indeed, debated. Most recently, C. Parisi Presicce and M. Wolf argued that the parallel rows of cavities would have housed stones with iron rings for fixing sacrificial animals. While, remarkably, no such stone was found here, evidence from other sites such as Klaros, Magnesia on Maeander, and Dion is cited as a possible parallel. Furthermore, the ensemble of stoai, pool, and cavities is now generally dated to the Hieronian period, for various reasons: because it is assumed that the monumental altar required some equally monumental enclosure;²² because the design of the porticus would correlate remarkably with that of the altar;

because the architectural elements of the Ionic propylon would resemble those of the altar in material and execution;²³ and because the stratigraphic context would suggest a Hellenistic date.²⁴ As a unified concept, the complex would have served as a monumental site for cults and festivals, appropriate for hecatomb sacrifices and a large audience that assembled in the porticoes. Regular athletic training can hardly be reconciled with this concept. Furthermore, literary sources mention the altar, but no gymnasium or palaestra in connection with this.

The debated chronology notwithstanding, both interpretations are intriguing, yet problematic: for the cult site theory, the precise function of the monumental pool and the absence of any of the over 100 stones for fixing animals require further explanation. The pool is certainly large and deep enough for swimming. In the eastern Mediterranean, such pools were built from the 4th century BC in gymnasia and Panhellenic sanctuaries, where they had no obvious cultic function but served for

20 These came mainly from the fill of a pozzo in the north-eastern part of the square that would have been sealed by the pavement of the square; Gentili 1954, 345–350, 353.

21 Gentili 1954, 353.

22 Parisi Presicce 2004; Lehmler 2005, 135–145; Campagna 2013, 50; Veit 2013, 34–35.

23 Wolf 2016, 48–49, based on the hitherto most detailed architectural examination of the altar-complex. The illustrative reconstruction 50, fig. 23 suggests, however, that the link between altar and porticoes was

rather awkward, because the altar was surrounded by a separate enclosure wall that was not aligned with the external walls of the south and north porticoes.

24 Zirone 2011, 176, with reference to Gentili 1954, however. It is not specified whether Hellenistic could be late Hellenistic, thus late 1st century BC. Bell 1999, 274–275, is the only one who points to the problematic stratigraphy and suggests that a series of new stratigraphic soundings should be carried out in order to closer determine the date of the porticoes-pool-ensemble.

athletic and leisure swimming.²⁵ For the palaistra theory, the combination of athletic facilities with a monumental altar remains unique in the ancient world and evidence of trees in the open square should be provided. Furthermore, clear labeling of the complex is challenging since it is neither a typical Greek palaistra, lacking the common rooms around the peristyle courtyard, nor a gymnasium with separate race track and rooms for other athletic activities. A hybrid complex with sufficiently long porticoes and open courtyard space for running and with a swimming pool would be without any comparison in the 3rd century BC and is indeed only known from later periods.

2. The identification of the so-called Roman Gymnasium in the Achradina as a gymnasium has long been refuted, partially based on the design with a combination of theater, temple, and porticoes.²⁶ Recent excavations showed, however, that the complex was originally built as a quadriporticus in the late Hellenistic period; the theater and temple were only added later, in the post-Tiberian period. It is still assumed, however, that the late Hellenistic quadriporticus already included a funerary monument, a temple, or a heroon, of which no evidence has survived though.²⁷ The size of the quadriporticus would certainly have been sufficient for a palaistra, but the Late Hellenistic date excludes that this is the Timoleonteion mentioned in literary sources.²⁸

3. In 1900, P. Orsi described “una specie di grandiosa vasca” that he excavated “sulla parte alta e pianeggiante dell’Acradina.”²⁹ Today, this area is identified as “all’interno delle mura dell’Epipole,” but the structure excavated by Orsi can apparently no longer be identified.³⁰ This structure had a size of 29.75×21.8 m and its rock-cut walls were strengthened with seven buttresses on the short and nine on the long sides, which

“sporgevano dalla linea perimetrale verso l’interno” (0.90×1.35 m). All vertical and horizontal surfaces were covered with a double layer of excellent *cocciopesto*. Four steps led down to the structure in the northeast corner, and a half-elliptical, rock-cut and heavily cemented conduit (1.15×0.5 m) was found in the center of the north wall. While the “vasca” was discovered in an elevation of 1.5 m under the modern level, its original depth is not indicated nor whether it was really fully excavated. In the fill were found many architectural elements that came probably from surrounding structures: lion waterspouts of different sizes, many cornice fragments with different moldings, fragments of figurative reliefs, all mostly made of limestone with stucco; and some colored stucco fragments. Orsi assumed that the space discovered by him was the palaistra of a quite lavishly decorated gymnasium, probably even the gymnasium in Tyche mentioned by Cicero.³¹

J. Delorme discussed Orsi’s note in his study of gymnasia. He identified the structure as a pool (‘piscine’), but doubted that it belonged to a palaistra or gymnasium.³² Shortly later, R. Ginouvès cautiously proposed that this pool could be ‘tardive’ because of its unusual size.³³ Neither Delorme nor Ginouvès seem to have visited the site, and it saw no further discussion after 1962. While the space with its waterproof coating most likely contained water, the interior buttresses clearly speak against its use as a purpose-built swimming pool and suggest that this was a large roofed cistern or reservoir, possibly with additional interior supports. Therefore, this structure, whose date (Hellenistic, Roman Imperial or later period?) must remain open, cannot serve as evidence of a palaistra or gymnasium.

In sum, the design and typology of gymnasia in Syracuse currently cannot be determined. At best, one

25 For Greek swimming pools, Trümper 2017; Trümper 2018. Wolf 2016, 49, cites the large pool (47×22.5 m, at least 1.3 m deep) at the Forum of Paestum as a parallel for the presumable cultic function of the Syracusan pool. This pool, which was erected in the Latin colony shortly after 273 BC, was originally included in an area with a simple enclosure wall, and its function is much debated: *piscina publica*, with or without cultic function (cult of Venus Verticordia?); *piscina* of a gymnasium; *piscina* of a campus for the *iuventus*; *horreum publicum*; the different interpretations are summarized in Borlenghi 2011, 234–237.

26 Wilson 1990, 106–111; Zirone 2011, 170–171.

27 Trojani 2005. For the date also Musumeci 2012.

28 Plut. *Tim.* 39; Nep. *Timol.* 5.4; Polyæn. 5.3.8. According to Trojani 2005, 178, fig. 1, the northern external wall was 76 m long, and the eastern external wall probably ca. 66 m, if the temple and theater were centrally

placed; since the porticoes are ca. 6 m wide, the interior courtyard would have been about 64×54 m, which is generously sized for a palaistra; cf. the measures of Hellenistic gymnasia and palaistrai von Hesberg 1995, 25–27, and von den Hoff 2009, 263–275.

29 Orsi 1900, 207.

30 Zirone 2011, 187–188; Orsi 1900, 207, locates the site with reference to the Atlas of Cavallari and Holms (Cavallari and Holm 1883, pl. III) close to the cistern marked with no. 70. Correlating the atlas plan with google maps suggests that the site no. 70 was located in the area that is bordered by the Via dei Servi di Maria in the east, the Via Giovanni Angelo Montorsoli in the west, and the Via Filisto in the south.

31 Orsi 1900, 208; Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.53 §119.

32 Delorme 1960, 91.

33 Ginouvès 1962, 134.

can cautiously infer from the description of the Timoleonteion that features known from gymnasia in the eastern Mediterranean also appeared in this Syracusan gymnasium, namely porticoes/stoai and palaestrai. Literary sources suggest that gymnasia were popular at least from the 4th to 1st century BC. While the archaeological evidence presently does not allow for enriching this rather fragmentary picture with safely identifiable remains, future investigations in the courtyard of Hieron's altar, the so-called Roman gymnasium, or in other areas might change this.

2 Morgantina

While Morgantina is not mentioned among the cities that, according to Diodorus Siculus,³⁴ belonged to Hieron's realm after his treaty with the Romans in 263 BC, it is commonly attributed to his kingdom.³⁵ Archaeological evidence suggests that the city thrived in the second half of the 3rd century BC when it was provided with a 'standard kit' of Hellenistic cities. Even though there is no epigraphic evidence testifying to the existence of a gymnasium in Morgantina, the early excavators identified the North stoa of the agora as a gymnasium that was built in the mid-3rd century BC by Hieron II. The terrace in front of the stoa would have served as a paradromis, a racetrack under the open sky, and the various rooms of the stoa as apodyterion, loutron, ephebeion etc.³⁶ This idea was convincingly rejected by M. Bell who showed that this was a highly symmetrically organized stoa with rooms for political-administrative functions, including probably a prytaneion.³⁷

Since Morgantina saw a major urban boom under the reign of Hieron II and was generously endowed with different public amenities (theater, stoai, bouleuterion, granaries, baths etc.) it seemed reasonable to keep looking for a gymnasium. Based on excavations in 2004/2005,

a potential candidate was identified in a quarter at the western border of the built city (Pl. 2).³⁸ This is the so-called Southeast Building on the northwestern lot (lot 1) of the insula W13/14S, which is surrounded by two public baths, the North Baths across Plateia B, and the South Baths across Stenopos W14. Arguments for an identification included: 1. a centrally placed wide entrance, flanked by two monumental structures, probably benches, 2. the vicinity of two public baths that would have been used in connection with the gymnasium; and 3. a strangely oblique wall in the south of the adjacent insula W14/15 S that could have delimited a race track.

None of these arguments are conclusive and convincing, however, and recent and ongoing fieldwork further refutes this identification: With a surface area of ca. 324 m², one lot of the orthogonal grid plan would have been astonishingly small for a palaestra building, especially in a city, where other public buildings are monumental. The race track would have been strangely placed in relation to the palaestra; at best, the entire insula with at least eight lots of 2592 m² (or even more) could have served as a gymnasium, but archaeological fieldwork does not support this idea. A geophysical survey performed in 2012 suggested that the entire insula was densely built with small structures. This is confirmed by the ongoing Contrada Agnese Project under direction of A. D. Walthall, which identified the Southeast Building as an independent building with a central courtyard. While this may have included a colonnade ('peristyle'), finds such as several large pithoi point to storage, and not to any athletic or intellectual use.³⁹ The strangely oblique southern facades of insula W14/15S and possibly also of insula W13/14S⁴⁰ are most likely due to the topography of the area and not visibly to the definition of any race track.

34 Diod. Sic. 23.4.1.

35 Bell 1988; Bell 1999; Bell 2007, esp. 195 n. 35; Campagna 2004, 156 n. 14 (critical discussion of the arguments); Walthall 2011, esp. 166 n. 41.

36 Sjöqvist 1962, 136–137; Allen 1970, 364.

37 Bell 1984–1985, 510–512; Bell 1988, 338 n. 77; Bell 2010, 733–734; Bell 2012, 112–113; Bell 2015, 71–72; Wilson 1990, 360 n. 92; Prag 2007, 89 n. 113.

38 Except for a brief reference in Prag 2007, 89 n. 113, this identification was not published in print so far, but was discussed as an intriguing idea by the team of the American Excavations at Morgantina. The South Baths – West Sanctuary Project, directed by S. K. Lucore and myself, also started with the assumption that this quarter (Contrada Agnese quarter) may

have been particularly designed and reserved for public facilities for athletic training, bathing, and other leisure or entertainment activities; Lucore 2015; Trümper 2015; preliminary reports on <https://morgantina.org> (visited on 27/11/2017).

39 Walthall, Souza, and Benton 2014; Walthall, Souza, and Benton 2016; Walthall, Souza, and Benton 2015; Benton et al. 2015.

40 While the southern border of insula W14/15S was revealed in 1971, see Allen 1974, 373 fig. 11, the southern border of insula W13/14S is unknown; the geophysical survey carried out in 2012 showed similarly oblique walls in the south of this insula, which could not be safely identified as a border or external wall, however.

So far, not a single safely identified gymnasium of the Hellenistic period is connected, spatially and functionally, with an independent public bath, because the form of ‘decadent’ hot bathing provided in public baths was incompatible with the notion of an ascetic toughening athletic lifestyle.⁴¹ Finally, residential use of the quarter with buildings occupying a standard lot of the orthogonal grid plan was recently confirmed by excavations in the insula to the west of the Southeast Building where a residential complex with central courtyard could be identified.⁴²

In sum, there is currently no evidence that the building boom in 3rd century BC Morgantina or any building activities in the 2nd/1st century BC included a gymnasium.

3 Megara Hyblaea

Megara Hyblaea certainly belonged to Hieron’s realm and also provides clear evidence of Hellenistic building activity. While the Hellenistic city was much smaller than its famous Archaic predecessor, it also was endowed with certain urban amenities, if not as lavishly as Morgantina. Despite the lack of epigraphic evidence of a gymnasium, a building at the southeastern border of the excavated city was identified “without doubt” as a gymnasium or palaistra of the Hellenistic period in the French guidebook of the site, obviously because of its size and plan (Pl. 3. 1–2).⁴³ On a surface area of 850 m² (25 × 34 m), the building includes a large courtyard with a single colonnade in the north and rooms opening off to the north and east. The courtyard would have been used for exercise, the large northern rooms b-d (with surface areas of 40 and 52 m²) for intellectual education, and maybe the adjacent northern street B, the largest street of the city, as a racetrack. The entrance would have

been in the east, from street D5. A well in the colonnade would have provided the water necessary for a palaistra, whereas the corresponding basins and channels vanished probably when the building was destroyed by the Romans in 214 BC. “Murs tardifs” in rooms b-d suggest that the building was reused for a different function “à l’époque romaine”.⁴⁴

While the size of the building is certainly impressive, it is not without comparison in local domestic architecture: the nearby house 49,19 had a similar size and also similarly large rooms.⁴⁵ Since the southern part of the so-called palaistra-lot was never excavated, it cannot be excluded that the courtyard was bordered by rooms in the south and southeast, thus conforming even more to typical courtyard houses. Indeed, trenches along the south and east walls of the building revealed stretches of walls that could have delineated further rooms.⁴⁶

The building has never been studied in detail, and the published stone plan includes no elevations. The currently visible remains suggest, however, that the building cannot easily be reconstructed as described above, because the levels of several central features do not correlate (Fig. 2). The southern walls of rooms b, c, and d are preserved at a homogeneous level, made of large fairly well worked blocks; while the row of blocks includes no thresholds, “la disposition des marques de pose et de trous de pince autorisent la restitution de large portes de 3 m environ.”⁴⁷ The preserved (original?) threshold between rooms d and e is at the same (or even slightly lower) level as the row of southern blocks of room. This suggests that rooms b, c, and d had no separate thresholds and thus no lockable doors, or that at least room d had a lower level, requiring steps down from the entrance into the room (of which nothing survives). The stylobate of the colonnade is at a much higher level than both the south wall of rooms b-d and the preserved border of the well.⁴⁸ The well and the elevated stylo-

41 Trümper 2009; Trümper 2014a; Trümper 2014b.

42 The South Baths – West Sanctuary project, identified the West Sanctuary as a house with a size of about 360 m² (see Monika Trümper, „Morgantina under Roman Rule. Recent Research in the Contrada Agnese Quarter“, in: O. Belvedere and J. Bergemann (eds.), *Römisches Sizilien: Stadt und Land zwischen Monumentalisierung und Ökonomie, Krise und Entwicklung*, Forthcoming.)

43 Vallet, Villard, and Auberson 1983, 41–43.

44 Vallet, Villard, and Auberson 1983, 43. Different now: Tréziny 2018, 237–238.

45 Haug and Steuernagel 2014: rooms B15 and D2 had surface areas of 39 m², the house had a surface area of 16–26 × 36 m (c. 790 m²) in its first

phase, see Haug and Steuernagel 2014, 62 fig. 70. Cf. also e.g. House 23,24 (ca. 844 m²), with at least five rooms of up to 44 m² surface area that partially open onto a single colonnade; Vallet, Villard, and Auberson 1983, 19, fig. 17. Tréziny 2018, 135–202.

46 Clearly visible on the stone plan in Vallet, Villard, and Auberson 1976, plans 63, 64, 69, 70. Tréziny 2018, 234 fig. 352.

47 Vallet, Villard, and Auberson 1983, 43. These are not visible today (without cleaning), and they are not marked on the stone plan, Vallet, Villard, and Auberson 1976, plan 63.

48 This is mentioned, but not further explained by Vallet, Villard, and Auberson 1983, 43. No traces of columns are visible on the rather uneven (weathered) surfaces of the blocks, and none are marked on Vallet,



Fig. 2 Megara Hyblaia, view of the 'palaistra,' from SW.

bate cannot have functioned simultaneously, unless the colonnade did not allow for free circulation between the courtyard and the porticus, which would have significantly hindered or even prevented access from the main entrance in the east to all rooms in the north and east (b–g), and would certainly have been detrimental to the functioning of a palaistra. The 'stylobate' seems strange, however, consisting of three layers of blocks, the uppermost protruding above the middle, and the middle partially protruding above the lowest visible layer. It seems that the level of the stylobate was raised in a second phase of use, probably with spoils. The position of the well that the reconstructed plan locates right in front of the entrance to the largest room b (Pl. 3. 1) is rather inconvenient for circulation in the porticus and the use of room b. While no evidence of a *loutron* survives (waterproof pavement, stucco, drainage, basins) this would be expected in a remote corner room, such as rooms e, f, or maybe g. Carrying water from the well to any of these rooms for filling potential wash basins would have been suboptimal, at best. Finally, using one of the major streets of the city for regular training (in the nude?) seems problematic, and in any case like a rather unfortunate makeshift solution.

In sum, identification of this building as a gymnasium or palaistra "sans aucun doute"⁴⁹ seems rather opti-

mistic. Comprehensive examination of this building and an evaluation of its complex history may provide more substantial proof for determining its (changing?) function. Until then, the building should probably be taken off the list of safely identified gymnasias.

4 Neaiton

Neaiton or Noto antica, another Hieronian city, is the key example in the debate about Hieronian gymnasium politics because of an inscription found in situ, which records an unspecified dedication of the Hieronian *Neaniskoi* (youths) under the two gymnasiarchs Ariston, son of Agath... and Philistion, son of Epikrates, at an unknown date.⁵⁰

ἐπὶ γυμνασιάρχῳ[ν]
 Ἀριστίωνος τοῦ Ἀγαθ[—],
 Φιλιστίωνος τοῦ Ἐπικράτ[εως]
 νεανίσ[κοι] Ἰε]ρώνειο[ι].

The inscription was carved into the rock, into a slightly recessed and crudely framed field of 0.65 × 2.12 m. It served as a kind of lintel or architrave "nello sfondo di un padiglione o protiro d'ingresso (prof. m. 1.6), alla porta

Villard, and Auberson 1976, plan 63. Cf. now also Tréziny 2018, 235–236. 50
 49 Vallet, Villard, and Auberson 1983, 41. See doubts expressed by Campana 2006, 29 n. 7, and now also by Tréziny 2018, 240.

IG XIV, 240; Manganaro 1963, 55–56 n. 32; Cordiano 1997, 61; ISic 1060; <http://sicily.classics.ox.ac.uk/inscription/ISic1060> (visited on 10/11/2018).



Fig. 3 Neaiton, 'gymnasion', staircase 4 and cistern 5, area 6, and copy of inscription (arrow) from SE.

che metteva ad un camerone di m. 6×4.65 ,”⁵¹ Since the inscription was sawed out and brought to the Biblioteca civica of Noto in 1894, and no photo or drawing documents its original position, the original context and function can no longer be evaluated. Today, a copy of the inscription is visible on site, carved into a large detached rock that shows some signs of working and dowel holes and may originally have belonged to the ceiling of one of the nearby rock-cut rooms (Fig. 3). Two aspects of the inscription are debated: first, whether Hieron is mentioned as the ‘owner’ of the neaniskoi, or as the founder of the gymnasion; second, whether the inscription was carved during the reign of Hieron, thus before 215 BC, or at a later date.⁵² Both problems cannot be discussed in detail here, even if a date before 215 BC seems more likely. As a reference to a gymnasion built by Hieron himself, the inscription would be highly astonishing as Hieron is not mentioned either as an active donor and euergetes in the nominative nor as the recipient of honors in the dative. In contrast to other gymnasia that pre-

sumably carried the names of their donors⁵³ the term Hieroneion is specifically not used here. And for no other example, Ptolemaic, Antiocheian or similar youths are known as reference to a gymnasion built by these rulers.

Even if the original position of the inscription remains unknown, the site where it was found can be assessed for its design and possible function. While the site was explored with some trenches and cleaning in 1972 and 1974, no comprehensive examination of all surviving features was ever published.⁵⁴

The complex identified as the gymnasion of Neaiton is located on the eastern slope of the city and includes a group of differently oriented and sized rock cut rooms, and an impressive terrace wall system, excavated for a length of about 80 m. The latter was dated to the Hieronian period, based on the wall technique and “pochi frammenti a vernice opaca raccolti sporadicamente nella zona.”⁵⁵ The terrain between the rooms and terrace wall is about 28 m wide, but structures partially excavated on this terrace all belonged to post-ancient periods. The

51 Orsi 1897, 81.

52 See discussion in Ferruti 2004, 193; gymnasion called after Hieron; Cordiano 1997, 61–63, votes for groups of youth called after Hieron; Lehmler 2005, 185, who generally doubts that Hieron pursued a program of cultural politics and systematically dedicated buildings in the cities of his realm, argues without further reference: “Es wurde in der Forschung sicherlich zu Recht nie daran gezweifelt, daß die nach Hieron II. benannten Neaniskoi in einem von Hieron gestifteten Gymnasion untergebracht waren.” Similarly Campagna 2006, 29. Date 2nd century BC: Mangano 1963, 55–56; La Rosa 1987–1988; Lehmler 2005, 185; ISic 1060,

<http://sicily.classics.ox.ac.uk/inscription/ISic1060> (visited on 10/11/2018); date 3rd century BC: Cordiano 1997, 61; implicitly also Ferruti 2004, Prag 2007, 91, does not really discuss the date, but seems to assume a Hieronian date.

53 The evidence was last assembled by Ameling 2007, 134–135 n. 34, who points out that only the Athenian Ptolemaion, which can safely be identified as a gymnasion, was demonstrably called after its donor.

54 Published by La Rosa 1987–1988; otherwise, see Orsi 1897, 81–82; La Rosa 1971, 58, 87–88; Arcifa 1993, 410; Ferruti 2004, 196–198.

55 Arcifa 1993, 410.




Fig. 4 Neaiton, plan of the 'gymnasion'.

bottom of the terrace wall is significantly lower than the openings of the rock cut rooms. Since the level of the rock cut rooms is nowhere indicated, however, it cannot be safely determined whether there was ever a wide terrace at one single level to the east of the rock cut rooms, and at what level this would have been in relation to the rock cut rooms.⁵⁶

It was assumed that the rock cut rooms served various functions related with the gymnasion, such as for administration (office of the gymnasiarchs), cult, changing (apodyterion), and education, and that the open terrace housed a dromos, paradomis or xystos.⁵⁷ Since a terrace of 28 m width seems generous for a simple racetrack, F. Ferruti argued that this could have housed the courtyard of the palaistra, whereas the paradomis should be located further south.⁵⁸

The currently visible remains cannot easily be reconciled with the typology, design and function of well-known gymnasia of the Late Classical and Hellenistic period. A brief overview of the features reveals numerous problems and questions that are not addressed in literature.⁵⁹

Five rooms or caves can be identified (Fig. 4, nos. 1, 2, 3, 7, 8), of which the largest two are still accessible (Fig. 4, nos. 2, 7); between these rooms, a built staircase with 13 steps (Fig. 4, no. 4) leads to the arched opening of a cistern. The site obviously suffered from some destruction by natural catastrophes (among them probably the famous earthquake in 1693 that destroyed the baroque city), which is most obvious in the area between the staircase and room 7 (Fig. 3; Fig. 4, no. 6); here, several large fragments seem to have broken off the natural rock, among them the worked piece with the copy of the inscription. Nevertheless, apart from this short stretch, the façade of the rock cut rooms seems largely preserved in its original (ancient) state. This is obvious from several facts: the rock was worked and smoothed in many places; the staircase seems fully preserved in a corner between the facades of stretches 3 and 6 (Fig. 3); and, most importantly, all stretches of the façade, except for the broken stretch no. 6, show various cuttings: round, rectangular or arched holes that may (at least partially) have served as (votive) niches; and a well-made channel that runs over

⁵⁶ The stone plan in La Rosa 1987–1988, pl. III includes only elevations for the remains of the terrace wall system. The published section pl. XI shows only the pavement of a 16th century house on the terrace, which is almost 5 m above the bottom of the terrace wall. Since the rock cut rooms are significantly higher, the terrace wall must have been at least 10 m high in order to support a flat terrain at the level of the rock cut rooms.

⁵⁷ Orsi 1897, 81–82; Arcifa 1993, 410; Ferruti 2004, 196–198.

⁵⁸ Ferruti 2004, 198.

⁵⁹ The following observations are based on a brief visit to the site in August 2016, when vegetation was still high and dense. For easier reference, rooms and features discussed here are marked with numbers on the plan Fig. 4.



Fig. 5 Neaiton, 'gymnasion', caves 1 and 2, from NE.



Fig. 6 Neaiton, 'gymnasion', cave 2 and façade of cave 3, from SE.

the openings of rooms 7 and 8, through a large rectangular niche between these two rooms. Similar cuttings are visible in the rooms themselves, which will briefly be described.⁶⁰

- Room 1 has, according to the published plan, a size of 2.5×3.4 m (8.5 m^2); its slightly arched wide opening is at least 2 m lower than that of the adjacent

room 2, and it is almost entirely blocked with debris (Fig. 5). The smoothed rock façade above the opening shows an oblique groove, and on top the remains of a well-made ashlar wall (at least four layers).

- Room 2 has a size of at least 8.7×4.3 m (37.4 m^2) and is 3.8 m high.⁶¹ The opening of about 8 m width is supported by a large central pillar that supports

⁶⁰ No detailed description is provided in literature.

⁶¹ Measures provided in La Rosa 1971, 87; the plan La Rosa 1987–1988, pl. III suggests a larger size: ca. 9.4×6.9 m.



Fig. 7 Neaiton, 'gymnasium', cave 2 SW corner, from NE.

the ceiling (partially cracked today) (Figs. 5, 6, 7). All walls are covered with cavities of different sizes, particularly in the lower parts (which could be easily reached?). The west wall includes a large niche that reached from the floor almost to the ceiling and seems to have been made to house something special, such as a statue or statue group. The bottom of the south wall and the northern west wall have man-made recesses under the small niches, probably destined for housing something (couches, chests, benches?). The transition to the façade stretch 3 was worked as a large recessed field with an arched top that includes a small arched niche.

- Stretch 3 is a smooth stretch of rock that includes some holes / 'niches,' roughly in a horizontal line at the same level (Figs. 3, 6). Under these holes is the opening to another rock cut room or recess (c. 3×1.5 m, 4.5 m²), which is almost entirely hidden behind debris and was as low as that of room 1.⁶²
- The seven lower steps of the staircase (4) are made of well-cut blocks, sitting on a rubble foundation that is built against the rock (Fig. 3). The upper steps are carved out of the rock.
- The cistern (5) has an arched opening right next to the steps of the staircase (Figs. 3, 8); it is round, widening from top to the bottom that is not visible, though, because the cistern is partially filled with debris; waterproof red plaster covers the visible parts of the interior. Above the arched opening are the remains of a wall made out of roughly cut blocks (at least two layers). A channel was cut into the rock, leading from the arched opening with a slight decline to the east, above the rock cut steps of the staircase; after a short stretch (four rock cut steps) it joins a vertical rock cut channel that comes from the terrace above rooms 6 and 7 and ends in another horizontal rock cut channel, at the level of the lowest rock cut step of the staircase. This channel follows the staircase until it breaks off, where part of room 6 was destroyed.
- Area 6 maybe have been the "vestibule" or "prothyron" described by P. Orsi,⁶³ but its design and accessibility currently cannot be reconstructed (Fig. 3). Since the façade of room 7 seems to be fully preserved, room 6 cannot have served as a vestibule to this room.
- Room 7 was described as a rectangular room with a

⁶² Its size may be suggested with a thinly dotted line on La Rosa 1987–1988, pl. III: 1.25×3.1 m. This plan shows some recesses and niches in the var-

⁶³ Orsi 1897, 81. ious rooms, but not consistently all of those that are currently visible.



Fig. 8 Neaiton, 'gymnasion', cistern 5 with channel system and built wall, from S.



Fig. 9 Neaiton, 'gymnasion', caves 7 and 8, façade with niche, channel, and cavities, from E.

size of ca. 6.15×4.65 m (28.6 m^2) (Figs. 3, 9, 10).⁶⁴ Since there are several cuttings in the worked rock above the northern part of its opening, the room can never have been fully rectangular. The opening is significantly lower than that of room 2, and it may have included above its southern part or between room 7 and 6 the inscription. In the interior, room 7 shows several cuttings in the south wall, among

them at floor level a large well-made niche in the southwest corner that may have housed something; a similar large niche is visible in the center of the north (or northwest) wall. Large parts of the walls and ceiling are covered with a whitish plaster. The room is filled with debris, among them several large blocks, and its entrance is partially blocked with a (modern) rubble wall.

⁶⁴ Orsi 1897, 81: 6×4.65 m; La Rosa 1971, 87: 6.15×4.25 m; the inscription would have been carved above the entrance to this room.



Fig. 10 Neaiton, 'gymnasium,' cave 7, W corner, from E.

- The entrance of room 8 is lower than that of room 7 and today largely blocked by debris (Fig. 9); it may have had a size of about 3.75×4.7 m (17.6 m²).
- Finally, the well smoothed rock façade above rooms 7 and 8 includes several rock cut features (Figs. 9, 11): 1. a large rectangular niche just at the intersection of the rooms that shows each two grooves in its upper side walls; 2. a half-round channel that ran from the south down to the north, leading through the large niche;⁶⁵ its precise provenance is unknown, but it seems to come from the terrace above 6, where some source such as a reservoir may have been located that also fed the channel system next to the staircase; its destination is also unknown because it just vanishes in the debris at the northern end of room 8. Above the channel, the rock façade of room 8 shows further cuttings for some unknown function; remains of a wall with roughly cut blocks are visible on top of the rock façade of rooms 7 and 8.

In sum, the remains are much more complex than hith-

erto known, incorporating built features and the rock that was exploited in its natural configuration, but also clearly worked in all visible parts (rooms 2 and 7, façade). It cannot be determined whether the group of rooms 1–8 with their highly irregular façade and varying orientation ever functioned as a clearly defined ensemble. There was obviously some larger built feature on top of features 6–8 that was most likely connected with the cistern and the channel systems, suggesting some coherent planning and function.⁶⁶

Two key problems remain to be discussed: The first key problem is dating: apart from the inscription that may have been seen in situ (but not further documented) by T. Fazello in 1558,⁶⁷ thus before the big earthquake, no safe evidence for dating survives. The overall well preserved rock walls provide no further evidence of inscriptions or at least graffiti which may seem astonishing. Problems of chronology regard particularly the numerous cuttings in the rooms and the façade, which, in theory, could have been made any time in antiquity or later. For example, the detached inscription shows two round holes right in the center of the second line and a larger rectangular cutting at the upper right edge, which

⁶⁵ A groove in the south wall of the niche suggests that a half-circular open channel made of wood, metal or terracotta bridged the niche between the rock cut parts. The water features are mentioned briefly by La Rosa 1971, 88 n. 175: "Sulla parete di roccia nella quale si aprono i cameroni, resti di canalette di scolo intagliate."

⁶⁶ Some cuttings and features are visible above rooms 2–3, from the top-most step of the staircase; but this area is too heavily overgrown for further evaluation.

⁶⁷ Ferruti 2004, 192.



Fig. 11 Neaiton, 'gymnasium', channel in façade of caves 7 and 8, from N.

all must post-date the carving (and major use?) of the inscription.⁶⁸ While some of the holes or the plaster in the caves could even have been made by shepherds and peasants after the earthquake of 1693, when the city was otherwise largely abandoned, this seems less likely for the more sophisticated system of channels and the large rectangular niche.⁶⁹ Even the impressive terrace wall system, which is still partially visible today, cannot be safely dated because the wall technique of the few preserved layers is hardly conclusive.

The second key problem is function: what were the wide open rooms with remarkably different heights of their openings⁷⁰ used for? Were they appropriate for any administrative function, athletic training (in the nude)

and intellectual education, or rather for other activities such as cult,⁷¹ assemblies, and dining? The water system is not visibly connected with any feature that may have served as a *loutron*, and the niche crossed by a channel rather suggests some cultic or decorative function, for example as a *nymphaion*. Finally, the completely irregular rock façade could not have been linked with built features on the wide terrace, such as a colonnade or *palaiestra* right in front of the rock cut rooms: features in front of the caves could not have been easily roofed (or at all) and would have taken all light from the caves.

Thus, for now the example in Noto does not allow for closer assessing a Hieronian or later standard gymnasium type – if this complex ever was a clearly defined gymnasium-complex at all.⁷²

5 Akrai

Akrai also belongs to the cities that were certainly part of Hieron's kingdom after 263 BC. A very fragmentary inscription mentioning two gymnasiarchs was found in 1814 in an unknown context and dated to the second half of the 2nd century BC, based on the lettering. The preserved fragments may have belonged to the records of gymnasiarchs.

ἐπὶ Ἀ[— — — — — τοῦ]
 Ἀρτέμ[ωνος Ἀφροδίται?]
 γυμνασ[ίαρχοι]
 Ἀρχέδαμ[ος]
 Νυμφο[δώρου]
 Πολύκλε[ιτος]
 [— — — — —]⁷³
 [Ἐπ]ὶ Ἡρα[κλείου? τοῦ δεινῶ]

68 See the photo of the detached inscription in Orsi 1897, 82.

69 La Rosa 1971, 88, assumed that the arched opening of the cistern was "verosimilmente posteriore", without giving any evidence or argument, however; it seems clearly linked with the channel system next to the staircase.

70 This requires further examination and explanation: rooms 1, 3, and 8 could only have been realistically accessible if the level of the terrain in front of them was significantly lower than today; consequently, the opening of room 2 would have been remarkably high.

71 Cf. the nearby caves with numerous niches, inscriptions and reliefs that

were identified as a Heroon: La Rosa 1971, pl. XIV, 3–4.

72 The ensemble recently excavated in Cava d'Ispica shows many similarities with the complex of caves in Noto, and full publication of the first may provide further insights for evaluating the second. The two largest caves in Cava d'Ispica include rock cut benches along three walls, however, which are clearly visible on the published plan and photo; Sammito and Rizzone 2014, fig. 8 pl. IX.

73 IG XIV, 213, followed by Cordiano 1997, 41–43 except for line 1 where he prefers Manni Piraino's interpretation, see Manni Piraino 1972–1973, 56–57 no. 31.

Ἀρτέμ[μιτι καὶ — — — — —]
 γυμνασ[ίαρχοι — — — — —]
 Ἀρχέδα[μος — — — — —]
 Νυμφο[δῶρου? — — — — —]
 Πολύκλ[ειτος — — — — —]
 [τοῦ δεῖνα]⁷⁴

While the theater and bouleuterion of Akrai are commonly dated to the 3rd century BC, thus testifying to a certain wealth and building boom under Hieron II, no gymnasium was ever identified. Furthermore, the post-Hieronian period of Akrai has received little attention until recently. Since 2009, a Polish project focuses on investigating the Roman to Byzantine periods of Akrai, employing various non-invasive methods and excavation.⁷⁵ The project does not include the complex of interest here, however, notably the so-called agora.

The area to the west of the theater and bouleuterion was presumably excavated in the 1980s to early 2000s, but never published beyond a rudimentary sketch.⁷⁶ Because of its location, west of the bouleuterion, south of the major east-west artery of the city, the area is commonly identified as an agora. The most remarkable excavated feature is a round room with a diameter of 10.2 m that is half cut into the rock, half built (Figs. 12, 13, 14, 15).⁷⁷

This room can be identified as a laconicum, a round sweat bath, based on the following criteria: a very narrow entrance door; a small triangular shaped anteroom with benches; waterproof pavement and stucco; some revolutionary roofing system of which cavities in the rock cut walls as well as built walls and some terracotta fragments preserved in situ in one of the cavities survive;⁷⁸ and typological comparisons, most notably with a similar room in the palaistra of Solunto (Pl. 4).

Currently, 42 safely identified round sweat baths are known from the entire Mediterranean, which were built in the 2nd and 1st centuries BC and not yet provided with sophisticated floor- or wall heating.⁷⁹ While

these bathing facilities were included in a remarkably broad variety of contexts, among them public baths, houses, clubhouses, gymnasia, and porticus-complexes, none was ever attached to a safely identified agora. The largest examples, with diameters of 5.9 to 9.95 m⁸⁰ were only found in gymnasia or palaistrai. Thus, the round room of Akrai, with 10.2 m the largest of the entire list, most likely belonged to a palaistra or gymnasium.

There are other features that support – or at least do not contradict – this identification. The plan published by G. Voza⁸¹ and Google Earth allow for identifying some features of the excavated area. The laconicum may have been situated in the southwest corner of a building that was prominently located on or close to the main east-west artery of the city. This street had been provided with a pavement and sidewalks in the 1st century BC.⁸² The building may have included a central peristyle courtyard with a cistern and rooms in the south and west (Figs. 14, 15). A line of well-worked blocks is visible in the southern part of the building, to the east of the round room. This may have been the stylobate of a stoa, suggested also by the pillars set up here (in modern times; Fig. 15). Some rock cut rooms with fairly regular, rectangular layouts opened onto this colonnade in the south. Just north of the stylobate, a fairly large rock cut pool may have served as a cistern; another, smaller equivalent is visible further west, close to the entrance of the laconicum (Figs. 14, 15). Rock cut steps in the western part of the area, to the north of the round room, may have belonged to another stoa without or with small rooms. A well-made niche with a molded socle in the northeastern outer corner of the round room may have been a small shrine or have housed an honorary monument. The rock cut rooms remind of the situation in Neaiton, but they are much more regularly organized here and combined with the conclusive laconicum.

While the size and plan of this complex currently cannot be determined, the size of the laconicum suggests that this was an ambitiously large ensemble. An area or

74 Manni Piraino 1972–1973, 56–57 no. 31. Cf. now also ISic 1033; <http://sicily.classics.ox.ac.uk/inscription/ISic1033> (visited on 10/11/2018).

75 Chowaniec 2014 with further literature.

76 Voza 1999, 129–139.

77 In 2003, I received generous permission from G. Voza to study this room on site, which is most gratefully acknowledged here.

78 The fully preserved rock cut cavities are remarkably long; of the cavities cut into ashlar blocks only the lowest part survives, because only one layer of ashlar is preserved. Wilson 2013, 96 n. 48, assumes brick ribbing. Guards on site confirm that the entire roof was found collapsed

onto to the floor, but the evidence was never published. It must remain open whether the room was covered with the traditional conical dome or already with a half dome, which would have been revolutionary.

79 Trümper 2008, 258–275.

80 Trümper 2008, 421–426 tab. 3: diameters of round rooms in the gymnasia of Assos (8.45 m), Eretria (9.95 m), Solunto (6.7 m), and Thera (5.92 m).

81 Voza 1999, 131 fig. 101.

82 Voza 1999, 129–139.

Site – Gymnasion (or parts of it)	Area in m ²
Agrigento, Paradromis / Xystos and pool	at least 4368 (excavated area)
Akrai Insula/Area	c. 4480–4760 (hypothetically calculated size of insula)
Amphipolis	
– Palaistra	1600
– Paradromis	5000
– Total	6600
Delos (“Gymnasion”)	
– Palaistra	3500
– Stadion	8400
– Total	11 900
Delphi	
– Palaistra	1200
– Loutron	750
– Paradromis	5000
– Total	6950
Eretria, Upper Gymnasion (double palaistra)	2593
Miletus, Hellenistic Gymnasion	1600
Neaiton	
– Rock-cut rooms	c. 100
– Terrace in front of rooms (28 × 80)	c. 2240
Olympia	
– Palaistra	4500
– Paradromis	20 000
– Total	24 500
Pergamon	
– Upper Terrace	6600
– Kellerstadion Area	7000
– Middle Terrace	5500
– Lower Terrace	1000
– Total	20 000
Solunto, Gymnasion (Palaistra)	1008
Syracuse, Area of Altar (Porticus triplex with courtyard)	7117
Syracuse, Quadriporticus of Roman Gymnasium	c. 5016
Taormina, ‘Library’ peristyle courtyard with rooms on 2 terraces	c. 705

Tab. 2 Gymnasia/palaistrai, comparison of sizes (sizes of non-Sicilian examples according to von den Hoff 2009; Ackermann and Reber in this volume).




Fig. 12 Akrai, schematic plan of area around the round room.

‘insula’ of about 80–85 NS \times 56 EW (4480–4760 m²) is bordered by streets in the north and west, and probably also east,⁸³ and by a steep cliff in the south (Fig. 12). The palaistra may not have occupied the entire 4480–4760 m², but have been bordered by shops in the north or even included a race track (in the east). It is quite clear, however, that there is not sufficient space for an additional appropriately sized agora.

A comparison with other sufficiently preserved

gymnasia/ palaistrai shows that an area of 4480–4760 m² would have been generously sized for a palaistra only, whereas it would have been small for a palaistra with race track. Furthermore, even the north-south extension of the area is not sufficiently long for a standard race track (Tab. 2).

Comparison with other agorai is much more difficult because comparable parameters are much harder to define.⁸⁴ A scale to scale comparison of several Sicilian

83 This is suggested by the sketch in Voza 1999, 131 fig. 101: the street ran to the west of the bouleuterion, which is located on a higher level than the laconicum and surrounding features.

84 What should be included into calculations: the open courtyard, stoai, adjacent ‘appropriate’ buildings such as bouleuteria that may also be located on different terraces and not immediately on the agora?



Fig. 13 Akrai, 'palaistra', laconicum, from NW.



Fig. 14 Akrai, 'palaistra', SW corner, from NE.

sites demonstrates, however, that the area in Akrai would have been small for an agora compared to the overall size of the city.⁸⁵

In sum, it is argued here that the so-called agora of Akrai was a palaistra or even gymnasium and that the real agora should be located somewhere else, for example in the vast area to the north of the theater and main road.

The crucial question of the date remains to be discussed. Currently, only typological criteria can be cited, notably the inclusion of a round sweat room, which has no safely dated parallels before the 2nd century BC. This would agree with the date of the above-mentioned inscription and the construction date of the gymnasium in Solunto, which is the closest typological comparison in Sicily.

85 Morgantina: city 78 ha; agora (square with stoai and adjacent buildings) c. 30 000 m²; Solunto: city 18 ha, agora (square with stoa) c. 2312 m²; Akrai: city 36 ha, 'agora' terrain 4480–4760 m²; furthermore, no elements

of an independent monumental stoa seem to have been found in Akrai, similar to several stoai of the agora of Morgantina and the Pi-shaped stoa of the agora in Solunto.



Fig. 15 Akrai, 'palaistra', S part with stoa, from NE.

6 Conclusion

The balance of gymnasia in eastern Sicily is disillusioning (Tab. 1). While literary and epigraphic sources testify to the existence of gymnasia from the 4th century BC onwards, not a single building survives that can safely be identified as a palaistra or gymnasium and is sufficiently preserved for assessing the typology, design, and function of this building type in eastern Sicily.

- The complexes in Syracuse are either sufficiently preserved, but not safely identifiable as a palaistra/gymnasium (peristyle courtyard next to Hieron's altar) or not fully preserved and thus not safely identifiable (Quadriporticus of the Roman Gymnasium).
- Morgantina provides no reasonably identifiable evidence at all.
- The presumable palaistra in Megara Hyblaia is fairly well preserved, but cannot be securely recognized as a palaistra.
- It is not certain that the often cited structures in Neaiton were ever used as a clearly defined and confined palaistra/gymnasium complex. Without the in-

scription, the site certainly would never have been identified as a potential venue of gymnasium activities as it lacks any well-known standard features that might suggest such a function. If the caves and possible adjacent structures served for athletic training and intellectual instruction, the 'gymnasium' may have been a site with little elaborated features and maybe even without access control.

- Akrai was recognized here as the site with the most securely identifiable gymnasium, although no gymnasium had been identified in literature so far. Since the complex has not been completely excavated, it cannot serve to reconstruct the possible typology of gymnasia in eastern Sicily. It may have been similar, however, to the only fully known and safely identifiable palaistra of entire Sicily, notably the one in Solunto (Pl. 4), but it was certainly significantly larger.⁸⁶
- None of the examples discussed here is fully published, including architecture and finds and providing a safely established chronology. In fact, dating remains a crucial problem for all examples, certainly regarding the archaeological remains and often also the inscriptions. This concerns not only the date of

⁸⁶ For the palaistra of Solunto, which is commonly called 'ginnasio'/gymnasium, see Cutroni Tusa 1994, 77–79; Mistretta 2013; Sposito

2014, 212–219.

construction, but also the later history and point of abandonment of the complexes. Therefore, archaeology currently does not allow for assessing the development and significance of the gymnasium as an institution and building type in eastern Sicily.

The many uncertainties regarding the examples discussed here render a comparative synthetic assessment of key features rather pointless. The urban context cannot be evaluated because central characteristics of the respective cities, such as the location of the agora, are unknown.⁸⁷ Two well-known examples suggest, however, that there were no obligatory standards for the location of palaestrai/gymnasia in Sicilian cities: the example in Solunto is located right next to the agora, whereas the one in Agrigento was built a significant distance away from the safely identified (upper) agora.⁸⁸ While location certainly mattered, local conditions and particularly the availability of space will have determined the placing of gymnasia, and not ideological concepts such as a specific intraurban or suburban location or a compellingly close combination of agora and gymnasium.⁸⁹

Examining an easily assessable and commonly standard feature of gymnasia such as bathing facilities, only two of the examples discussed here provide conclusive evidence, notably the complex next to Hieron's altar and the building in Akrai. The aforementioned safely identified examples, the gymnasium in Agrigento and the palaestra in Solunto, both included bathing facilities, suggesting that this was common in Sicilian athletic facilities. The lack of bathing facilities in the Quadriporticus of Syracuse and the complexes of Megara Hyblaia and Neaiton⁹⁰ may go back to the insufficient state of excavation, preservation, and publication, but may also indicate that these were not (standard?) athletic facilities.

A stronger common denominator is the courtyard with stoa(i) or even peristyle courtyard, included in the complexes of Syracuse, Megara Hyblaia, and Akrai, but this element is far too generic and common in many dif-

ferent Hellenistic building types and contexts to serve as a conclusive criterion for identifying palaestrai.⁹¹

Textual sources are only little more illuminating for reconstructing the appearance of gymnasia in eastern Sicily. When Plutarch mentions stoai and palaestrai for the Timoleonteion in Syracuse that served as a gymnasium for the *neoi*, he lists elements known from Greek gymnasia in the eastern Mediterranean. Plutarch is a late source, however, and his remarks cannot easily be understood. He suggests that an agora⁹² was transformed into a gymnasium, by first building Timoleon's tomb in the agora, then surrounding the agora with stoai, and finally building palaestrai within or next to the agora. This is an intriguing, yet unparalleled genesis and description of a gymnasium, which does not allow reconstructing the design of this specific gymnasium, let alone of others in and outside the city.⁹³

The gymnasia that Hieron built on his ship and elsewhere⁹⁴ are not described in any detail. The extensive financial accounts from Tauromenion confirm that numerous agones were held and oil was used in the local gymnasium,⁹⁵ but otherwise do not mention any expenses for the construction and maintenance of structures in the gymnasium.

Coming back to the initial question: Prag's optimistic assumption currently cannot be corroborated by the archaeological record for the Hellenistic or even Roman period of eastern Sicily, either because gymnasia did not exist in great numbers, were not yet found, or were not recognized because they did not include designs and features common of Greek equivalents in the eastern Mediterranean; they may have been sites, equipped at best with temporary or makeshift features, rather than elaborate built complexes. If the complexes in Akrai and Syracuse were only built in the 2nd and 1st century BC and served for gymnasium activities, they would confirm Campagna's argument.

Hieron's building and cultural politics regarding gymnasia in Syracuse and in his realm cannot be assessed

87 For example, from the examples listed in table. 1, the location of the agora is only safely known in Megara Hyblaia, Morgantina, Solunto, and possibly Tauromenion, but not in Akrai, Neaiton, and Syracuse.

88 Assuming with Wilson 2012, 246–247, that the so-called lower agora is a modern fiction. For the gymnasium in Agrigento, see Fiorentini 2009.

89 Against ideologically motivated standard locations: von den Hoff 2009, 252; pro: von Hesberg 1995; Mistretta 2013 who identifies a specific agora-gymnasium-type.

90 As well as those in Tauromenion.

91 Emme 2013, and B. Emme in this volume.

92 Plut. *Tim.* 39, see above n. 11. It remains open whether this is one of several agorai in Syracuse, and whether this would have been the main or a secondary agora.

93 To name just some problems: did the stoai around the former agora serve as trace tracks; why did the complex include two or more palaestrai, although Plutarch mentions only the *neoi* as users, and where exactly were these palaestrai located in relation to the agora with stoai?


94 Athen. V 206e, 207d.

95 Cordiano 1997, 72–82.


from the archaeological record; even the structures in Neaiton should be evaluated much more cautiously than is commonly done based on a single problematic inscription. Research on gymnasia outside of Hieron's realm, most notably in Agrigento and Solunto,⁹⁶ has already shown that the gymnasium was an important institution in the Late Hellenistic period when it was included in ur-

ban building programs as a clearly defined, built feature, prestigious and in even monumental. Providing more reliable dates and information for the complexes discussed here, particularly the example in Akrai, could substantiate this picture and significantly contribute to the ongoing reevaluation of cities in Roman Sicily.

⁹⁶ Cutroni Tusa 1994, 77–79; Fiorentini 2009; Mistretta 2013; Sposito 2014, 212–219.




Pl. 1 Syracuse, plan of the city.



Pl. 2 Morgantina, Contrada Agnese Quarter, plan.



Pl. 3 Megara Hyblaia, 'palaistra', stone plan (1) and reconstructed plan (2).



Pl. 4 Solunto, Gymnasion, schematic plan.

Bibliography

Allen 1970

Hubert L. Allen. "Excavations at Morgantina (Serra Orlando). 1967–1969. Preliminary Report X". *American Journal of Archaeology* 74 (1970), 359–383.

Allen 1974

Hubert L. Allen. "Excavations at Morgantina (Serra Orlando). 1970–1972 Preliminary Report XI". *American Journal of Archaeology* 78 (1974), 361–383.

Ameling 2007

Walter Ameling. "Wohltäter im hellenistischen Gymnasium". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*. Ed. by Daniel Kah and Peter Scholz. Berlin: Verlag Antike, 2007, 129–162.

Arcifa 1993

Lucia Arcifa and Vincenzo La Rosa. "Noto". In *Bibliografia topografica della colonizzazione greca in Italia e nelle isole tirreniche XII*. Ed. by G. Nenci. Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore, 1993, 410–412.

Bell 1984–1985

Malcolm Bell. "Recenti scavi nell'agora di Morgantina". *Kokalos* 30–31 (1984–1985), 501–520.

Bell 1988

Malcolm Bell. "Excavations at Morgantina, 1980–1985. Preliminary Report XII". *American Journal of Archaeology* 92 (1988), 313–344.

Bell 1999

Malcolm Bell. "Centro e periferia nel regno siracusano di Ierone II". In *La colonisation grecque en Méditerranée occidentale. Actes de la rencontre scientifique en hommage à Georges Vallet (Naples and Rome, 15–18 novembre 1995)*. Collection de l'Ecole française de Rome 251. Rome: École française de Rome, 1999, 257–277.

Bell 2007

Malcolm Bell. "An Archaeologist's Perspective on the Lex Hieronica". In *La Sicile de Cicéron: Lectures des Verrines*. Ed. by J. Dubouloz and S. Pittia. Besançon: Presses Univ. de Franche-Comté, 2007, 187–203.

Bell 2010

Malcolm Bell. "Serra Orlando". In *Bibliografia topografica della colonizzazione greca in Italia e nelle isole Tirreniche XVIII*. Ed. by G. Nenci and G. Vallet. Pisa, Rome, and Naples: Scuola Normale Superiore, 2010, 724–751.

Bell 2012

Malcolm Bell. "Spazio e istituzioni nell'agora greca di Morgantina". In *Agora greca e agorai di Sicilia*. Ed. by C. Ampolo. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2012, 111–118.

Bell 2015

Malcolm Bell. "Gli dei dell'agora". In *Morgantina ieri e oggi*. Ed. by L. Maniscalco. Palermo: Museo di Aidone, 2015, 68–81.

Benton et al. 2015

Jared Benton, R. Benjamin Gorham, Alex Walthall, Randall Souza, Leigh A. Lieberman, David Massey, James Huemoeller, Jared Benton, Anne Truetzel, and Aislinn Samalling. "Recenti scavi a Morgantina: il progetto Contrada Agnese (2013–2014)". *Geologia dell'Ambiente*. Supplemento al n. 2/2015 (2015), 19–24.

Borlenghi 2011

Aldo Borlenghi. *Il Campus. Organizzazione e funzione di uno spazio pubblico in età romana. Le testimonianze in Italia e nelle Province occidentali*. Rome: Quasar, 2011.

Campagna 2004

Lorenzo Campagna. "Architettura e ideologia della basilica a Siracusa nell'età di Ierone II". In *Nuove prospettive della ricerca sulla Sicilia del III a.C. Archeologia, numismatica, storia. Atti dell'Incontro di studio, Messina, 4–5 luglio 2002*. Ed. by M. Caccamo Caltabiano, L. Campagna, and A. Pinzone. Soveria Mannelli: Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità dell'Università degli Studi di Messina, 2004, 151–189.

Campagna 2006

Lorenzo Campagna. "L'architettura di età ellenistica in Sicilia. Per una rilettura del quadro generale". In *Sicilia ellenistica, consuetudo italica. Alle origini dell'architettura ellenistica d'Occidente. Spoleto, Complesso monumentale di S. Nicolò, 5–7 novembre 2004*. Ed. by M. Osanna and M. Torelli. Pisa: Accademia Editoriale, 2006, 15–34.

Campagna 2013

Lorenzo Campagna. "Monumenti e potere regio a Siracusa nell'età di Ierone II". In *Archimede. Arte e scienza dell'invenzione*. Ed. by G. Di Pasquale and C. Parisi Presicce. Florence: GAMM Giunti, 2013, 49–53.

Cavallari and Holm 1883

Francesco Cavallari and Adolfo Holm. *Siracusa. Topografia archeologica di Siracusa. Atalante*. Palermo: Tip. del giornale 'Lo statuto', 1883.

Chowaniec 2014

Roksana Chowaniec. "Palazzolo Acreide, Sicily, Italy. Excavations in 2014". *Światowit XII (LIII)* (2014), 165–170.

Cordiano 1997

Giuseppe Cordiano. *La Ginnasiarchia nelle 'poleis' dell'Occidente mediterraneo antico*. Studi e testi di storia antica 7. Pisa: ETS, 1997.

Cutroni Tusa 1994

Aldina Cutroni Tusa. *Solunto*. Rome: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, Libreria dello Stato, 1994.

Delorme 1960

Jean Delorme. *Gymnasium. Étude sur les monuments consacrés à l'éducation en Grèce (des origines à l'Empire romain)*. Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 196. Paris: De Boccard, 1960.

Dimartino 2011

Alessia Dimartino. "Fonti Epigrafiche". In *Siracusa. Immagine e storia di una città. Per lo studio delle fonti letterarie epigrafiche e numismatiche e della storia della ricerca archeologica*. Ed. by C. Ampolo. Bibliografia topografica della colonizzazione greca in Italia e nelle Isole Tireniche XIX. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2011, 59–132.

Emme 2013

Burkhard Emme. *Peristyl und Polis. Entwicklung und Funktion öffentlicher griechischer Hofanlagen*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013.

Ernst 2015

Paul Ernst. "Réflexions sur les relations entre Romains et gymnase(e) grec(s)". *Ktema: civilisations de l'Orient, de la Grèce et de Rome antiques* 40 (2015), 267–277.

Ferruti 2004

Francesco Ferruti. "L'attività di Ierone II a favore dei ginnasi". In *Nuove prospettive della ricerca sulla Sicilia del III a.C. Archeologia, numismatica, storia. Atti dell'Incontro di studio (Messina, 4–5 luglio 2002)*. Ed. by M. Caccamo Caltabiano and L. Campagna. Soverina Manelli: Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità dell'Università degli Studi di Messina, 2004, 191–212.

Florentini 2009

Graziella Florentini. "Il ginnasio di Agrigento". *Sicilia antiqua: International Journal of Archeology* 6 (2009), 71–109.

Gentili 1954

Gino V. Gentili. "Siracusa. Ara di Ierone. Campagna di Scavo 1950–1951". *Notizie degli scavi di antichità* (1954), 331–361.

Ginouvé 1962

René Ginouvé. *Balaneutikè. Recherches sur le bain dans l'antiquité grecque*. Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 200. Paris: De Boccard, 1962.

Gulick 2002

Charles Burton Gulick. *Athenaeus: The Deipnosophists*, Volume II. Trans. by Charles Burton Gulick. Loeb Classical Library 208. London: Heinemann, 2002.

Haug and Steuernagel 2014

Annette Haug and Dirk Steuernagel. *Das Haus XV B (Maison 49, 19) von Megara Hyblaia. Zur architektonischen und funktionalen Gliederung von Zweithofhäusern im hellenistischen Sizilien*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2014.

von Hesberg 1995

Henner von Hesberg. "Das griechische Gymnasion im 2. Jh. v. Chr." In *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus. Kolloquium München 24. bis 26. Juni 1993*. Ed. by M. Wörrle and P. Zanker. Vestigia 47. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995, 13–27.

von den Hoff 2009

Ralf von den Hoff. "Hellenistische Gymnasia: Raumgestaltung und Raumfunktion". In *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus. Die hellenistische Polis als Lebensform*. Ed. by A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann. 1. Berlin: Verlag Antike, 2009, 245–276.

ISic

Jonathan Prag, James Cummings, James Chartrand, Valeria Vitale, and Michael Metcalfe. *I. Sicily*. URL: <http://sicily.classics.ox.ac.uk>.

La Rosa 1971

Vincenzo La Rosa. "Archeologia sicula e barocca. Per la ripresa del problema di Noto antica". *Atti e memorie dell'Istituto per lo studio e la valorizzazione di Noto* 2 (1971), 43–102.

La Rosa 1987–1988

Vincenzo La Rosa. "Per la Neaiton ellenistica. Un saggio di scavo nella zona del ginnasio". *Atti e memorie dell'Istituto per lo studio e la valorizzazione di Noto* 18–19 (1987–1988), 75–104.

Lehmmler 2005

Carolina Lehmmler. *Syrakus unter Agathokles und Hieron II. Die Verbindung von Kultur und Macht in einer hellenistischen Metropole*. Frankfurt/M.: Verlag Antike, 2005.

Lucore 2015

Sandra K. Lucore. "Le terme sud di morgantina: impianti idrico e di riscaldamento". In *Morgantina ieri e oggi*. Ed. by L. Maniscalco. Palermo: Museo di Aidone, 2015, 102–114.

Manganaro 1963

Giacomo Manganaro. "Nuove ricerche di epigrafia siceliota". *Siculorum gymnasium* 16 (1963), 51–64.

Manganaro 1999

Giacomo Manganaro. *Sikelia. Studi di antichità e di epigrafia della Sicilia Greca*. Pisa and Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 1999.

Mango 2009

Elena Mango. "Il ginnasio in Sicilia. Un caso particolare?" In *Immagine e immagini della Sicilia e di altre isole del Mediterraneo antico. Atti delle seste giornate internazionali di studi sull'area elima e la Sicilia occidentale nel contesto mediterraneo, Erice, 12–16 ottobre 2006*. Ed. by C. Ampolo. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2009, 763–772.

Manni Piraino 1972–1973

Maria T. Manni Piraino. "Epigrafia siceliota". *Kokalos: Studi pubblicati dall'Istituto di storia antica dell'Università di Palermo* 18–19 (1972–1973), 339–347.

Mertens 2006

Dieter Mertens. *Städte und Bauten der Westgriechen. Von der Kolonisationszeit bis zur Krise um 400 vor Christus*. Munich: Hirmer, 2006.

Mistretta 2013

Alessia Mistretta. "Dalla paradromis all'agorà-ginnasio di Solunto. Componenti architettoniche e sintassi topografico-urbanistica". *Mare Internum: archeologia e culture del Mediterraneo* 5 (2013), 101–119.

Musumeci 2012

Agostina Musumeci. "Materiali ellenistici dal ginnasio romano. Un altare extramoenia per la grande dea della natura". *Archivio storico siracusano* 4 (2012), 617–638.

Neutsch 1954

Bernhard Neutsch. "Archäologische Grabungen und Funde im Bereich der Soprintendenzen von Sizilien (1949–1954)". *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 1954 (1954), 466–706.

Orsi 1897

Paolo Orsi. "Noto Vecchio (Netum). Esplorazioni archeologiche". *Notizie degli scavi di antichità* (1897), 69–90.

Orsi 1900

Paolo Orsi. "Avanzi di fabbricato nel podere De Matteis sull'Acradina." *Notizie degli scavi di antichità* (1900), 207–208.

Parisi Presicce 2004

Claudio Parisi Presicce. "Ecatombi nell'area dell'altare di Ierone II a Siracusa". In *Nuove prospettive della ricerca sulla Sicilia del III a.C. Archeologia, numismatica, storia. Atti dell'Incontro di studio (Messina, 4–5 luglio 2002)*. Ed. by M. Caccamo Caltabiano, L. Campagna, and A. Pinzone. Soverina Manelli: Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità dell'Università degli Studi di Messina, 2004, 213–228.

Perrin 1918

Bernadotte Perrin. *Plutarch's Lives. Dion and Brutus. Timoleon and Aemilius Paulus. English Translation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918.

Prag 2007

Jonathan Prag. "Auxilia and Gymnasia: A Sicilian Model of Roman Imperialism." *Journal of Roman Studies* 97 (2007), 68–100.

Sammito and Fiorilla 2013

Annamaria Sammito and Salvina Fiorilla. "Sulle tracce di Bizantini e Arabi. Primi dati da Cava d'Ispica". In *La Sicilia del IX secolo tra Bizantini e Musulmani*. Ed. by S. Modeo, M. Congiu, and L. Santagati. Caltanissetta: Sciascia, 2013, 209–228.

Sammito and Rizzone 2014

Annamaria Sammito and Vittorio Rizzone. *Cava Ispica. L'Area Archeologica*. Ragusa, 2014.

Sjöqvist 1962

Erik Sjöqvist. "Excavations at Morgantina (Serra Orlando) 1961. Preliminary Report VI." *American Journal of Archaeology* 66 (1962), 135–143.

Sposito 2014

Alberto Sposito. *Solunto. Paesaggio città architettura*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2014.

Stucchi 1954

Sandro Stucchi. "Scavi nella zona dell'Ara di Gerone, Fasti Archeologici". *Annual Bulletin of Classical Archaeology* 7 (1952) (1954), 174–175, no. 2092.

Tréziny 2018

Henri Tréziny. *Mégara Hyblaea 7. La ville classique, hellénistique et romaine, avec la collaboration de Frédéric Mège*. Rome: École française de Rome, 2018.

Trigilla 2011

Melchiorre Trigilla. *La Cava d'Ispica. Archeologia storia e guida*. Ispica: Trigilia Cultura, 2011.

Trojani 2005

Maria Trojani. "Il c.d. ginnasio romano di Siracusa". In *Μεγαλαί νησοί. Studi dedicati a Giovanni Rizza per il suo ottantesimo compleanno*. Ed. by R. Gigli. 2. Palermo: CNR, 2005, 177–186.

Trümper 2008

Monika Trümper. *Die „Agora des Italiens“ in Delos. Baugeschichte, Architektur, Ausstattung und Funktion einer späthellenistischen Porticus-Anlage*. Internationale Archäologie 104. Rahden/Westf.: Marie Leidorf, 2008.

Trümper 2009

Monika Trümper. "Complex Public Bath Buildings of the Hellenistic Period. A Case-Study in Regional Differences". In *Le bain collectif en Égypte, Institut français d'archéologie orientale*. Ed. by M. Fr. Boussac, Th. Fournet, and B. Redon. Études urbaines 7. Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 2009, 139–179.

Trümper 2014a

Monika Trümper. "Greek Baths and Bathing Culture". In *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*. Ed. by C. Smith. sub verbum B. New York: Springer Reference, 2014, 784–799.

Trümper 2014b

Monika Trümper. "Privat versus Öffentlich in hellenistischen Bädern". In *Stadtkultur im Hellenismus, Die hellenistische Polis als Lebensform*. Ed. by A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann. 4. Mainz: Verlag Antike, 2014, 206–249.

Trümper 2015

Monika Trümper. "South Baths at Morgantina: Assessment of the Heating System in the Context of Graeco-Roman Public Baths". In *Morgantina ieri e oggi*. Ed. by L. Maniscalco. Palermo: Museo di Aidone, 2015, 102–114.

Trümper 2017

Monika Trümper. "Greek Swimming Pools: Case-Study Olympia". In *Cura Aquarum in Greece. Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on the History of Water Management and Hydraulic Engineering in the Mediterranean Region: Athens, Greece, 28–30 March 2015*. Ed. by Kai Wellbrock. Schriften der Deutschen Wasserhistorischen Gesellschaft 28. Siegburg: DWHG Papierflieger Verlag GmbH, 2017, 215–250.

Trümper 2018

Monika Trümper. "Swimming Pools and Water Management in the Eastern Mediterranean World of the 4th to 1st Century BC". In *Water Management in Ancient Civilizations*. Ed. by J. Berking. Berlin: Edition Topoi, 2018, 255–296. doi:doi:10.17171/3-53.

Vallet, Villard, and Auberson 1976

Georges Vallet, François Villard, and Paul Auberson. *Mégara Hyblaea 1. Le Quartier de l'agora archaïque*. Paris: De Boccard, 1976.

Vallet, Villard, and Auberson 1983

Georges Vallet, François Villard, and Paul Auberson. *Mégara Hyblaea 3. Guide des fouilles. Introduction à l'histoire d'une cité coloniale d'occident*. Paris: De Boccard, 1983.

Veit 2013

Caroline Veit. "Hellenistic Kingship in Sicily: Patronage and Politics under Agathokles and Hieron II". In *Sicily. Art and Invention between Greece and Rome*. Ed. by C. Lyons, M. Benett, and C. Marconi. Los Angeles: Getty Museum, 2013, 27–37.

Voza 1999

Giuseppe Voza. *Nel segno dell'antico*. Palermo: Lombardi, 1999.

Walthall 2011

Alex Walthall. "Magistrate Stamps on Grain Measures in Early Hellenistic Sicily". *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 179 (2011), 159–169.

Walthall, Souza, and Benton 2014

Alex Walthall, Randall Souza, and Jared Benton. "Preliminary Report on the 2013 Field Season of the American Excavations at Morgantina. Contrada Agnese Project (CAP)". *The Journal of Fasti Online* 322 (2014). URL: <http://www.fastionline.org/docs/FOLDER-it-2014-322.pdf> (visited on 27/08/2018).

Walthall, Souza, and Benton 2015

Alex Walthall, Randall Souza, and Jared Benton. *Contrada Agnese Project (CAP) 2015, Report from the Field*. 2015.

Walthall, Souza, and Benton 2016

Alex Walthall, Randall Souza, and Jared Benton. "Preliminary Report on the 2014 Field Season of the American Excavations at Morgantina. Contrada Agnese Project (CAP)". *The Journal of Fasti Online* 324 (2016). URL: <http://www.fastionline.org/docs/FOLDER-it-2016-364.pdf> (visited on 27/08/2018).

Wilson 1988

Roger J. A. Wilson. "A Wandering Inscription from Rome and the So-Called Gymnasium at Syracuse". *American Journal of Archaeology* 71 (1988), 161–166.

Wilson 1990

Roger J. A. Wilson. *Sicily under the Roman Empire. The Archaeology of a Roman Province 36 BC – AD 535*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1990.

Wilson 2012

Roger J. A. Wilson. "Agorai and Fora in Hellenistic and Roman Sicily. an Overview of the Current Status Quaestionis". In *Agora greca e agorai di Sicilia*. Ed. by C. Ampolo. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2012, 245–267.

Wilson 2013

Roger J. A. Wilson. "Hellenistic Sicily, c. 270–100 BC". In *The Hellenistic West. Rethinking the Ancient Mediterranean*. Ed. by J. R. W. Prag and J. C. Quinn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013, 79–119.

Wolf 2016

Markus Wolf. *Hellenistische Heiligtümer in Sizilien. Studien zur Sakralarchitektur innerhalb und außerhalb des Reiches König Hierons II. Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Sonderschriften* 20. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2016.

Zirone 2011

Donata Zirone. "Storia della ricerca archeologica". In *Siracusa. Immagine e storia di una città. Per lo studio delle fonti letterarie epigrafiche e numismatiche e della storia della ricerca archeologica*. Ed. by C. Ampolo. Bibliografia topografica della colonizzazione greca in Italia e nelle Isole Tireniche XIX. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2011, 149–208.

Illustration and plate credits

ILLUSTRATIONS: 1 Neusch 1954, 594 fig. 71. 2–3 M. Trümper. 4 M. Trümper after La Rosa 1987–1988, pl. III. 5–11 M. Trümper. 12 M. Trümper after Voza 1999, 131 fig. 101 and google earth. 13–15 M. Trümper.
PLATES: 1 M. Trümper after Mertens 2006, 311 fig. 567.

2 © American Excavations at Morgantina; E. Thorkildsen.
3 Vallet, Villard, and Auberson 1976, plans 63, 64, 69, 70. Vallet, Villard, and Auberson 1983, 42 fig. 32. 4 Cutroni Tusa 1994, 78 pl. 23.

MONIKA TRÜMPER

Dr. phil. (Munich 1995), Habilitation (Heidelberg 2005), is a Professor of Classical Archaeology at the Freie Universität Berlin and Spokesperson of the Berlin Graduate School of Ancient Studies for the FU. Her research focuses on Hellenistic and Roman architecture and urban studies, particularly domestic architecture, bathing culture, agorai/porticus, and commercial architecture. She did fieldwork in Delos and currently has excavation projects in Morgantina and Pompeii.

Prof. Dr. Monika Trümper
Freie Universität Berlin
Institut für Klassische Archäologie
Fabeckstr. 23–25
14167 Berlin, Germany
E-Mail: monika.truemper@fu-berlin.de

Alessandra Avagliano, Riccardo Montalbano

Greek Gymnasia for Non-Greek People. Archaeological and Epigraphic Evidence in Pre-Roman Italy

Summary

Literary, epigraphic and archaeological sources testify to the presence of Greek gymnasia in pre-Roman Italy. This paper investigates the political and cultural reasons that led to the adoption of a Greek lifestyle in 'non Greek' contexts, most notably the embracing of the gymnasial ideology. Examining several case studies in two different cultural contexts, namely the Brettian city of Petelia and the Samnite cities of Abella, Pompeii, and Cuma, it is comparatively assessed how the elite of these cities negotiated Greek gymnasial ideology. It is argued that strategies ranged from fully embracing the gymnasium as both an institution and building type to selective emulation of only certain features.

Keywords: gymnasium; vereia; Hellenization; Petelia; Abella; Pompeii; Cuma

Literarische, epigraphische und archäologische Quellen bezeugen die Existenz griechischer Gymnasia im vorrömischen Italien. Dieser Beitrag untersucht die politischen und kulturellen Gründe, die zur Übernahme griechischen Lebensstils, allen voran der Gymnasiums-Ideologie, in diesen nicht-griechischen Kontexten geführt haben können. Anhand von Fallstudien in zwei verschiedenen kulturellen Kontexten, der brettischen Stadt Petelia und den samnitischen Städte Abella, Pompeji und Cuma, wird analysiert, wie die Elite dieser Städte griechische Gymnasiums-Ideologie ausgehandelt hat. Es wird gezeigt, dass Strategien von der vollständigen Übernahme des Gymnasiums als Institution und Bautyp bis zur selektiven Nachahmung ausgewählter Charakteristika reichte.

Keywords: Gymnasium; vereia; Hellenisierung; Petelia; Abella; Pompeji; Cuma

The concept of Hellenization, usually referring to the spread of Greek culture and its adoption by non-Greek people, has been often used incorrectly. As Mario Lombardo has recently pointed out, scholars usually have adopted the notion to describe people as a passive object of an external process (we often read that people have been Hellenized), in contrast with the original meaning of the verb 'ellenizein'. In fact, this verb is intransitive and means firstly 'to speak Greek', but in a wider sense to adopt and show Greek practices or cultural elements, as the consequence of a selective reception.¹

Among the most typical features of Hellenic culture, athleticism penetrates the early Etruscan and Italic society. While there are no literary testimonies about the existence of athletic competitions in pre-Roman Italy, a rich series of figurative monuments, the majority from funerary contexts, demonstrates the execution of games during the burial ceremonies of prominent people.² The ideology and the values connected to athleticism were adopted by the Italic aristocracies already during the 6th and 5th century BC, as shown by an extraordinary discovery, notably the tomb of the so-called Warrior of Lanuvium (Fig. 1).³

The tomb, dug into tuff stone, revealed a peperino sarcophagus including a rich panoply and a complete gymnastic set: three *alabastra* (one is missing today), two iron strigils, a leather pouch for sand and a bronze discus finely engraved. The association of these different categories of objects implies a complex ideology based on the Italic military tradition, which is at the same time, however, strongly influenced by Greek cultural models.

Athleticism and sport practice exercised a deep influence on the imagination of the Etruscan and Italic peoples for a long time. Therefore, during the Hellenistic period the number of products for body care increased significantly. For example, the diffusion of strigils reached high levels in funerary contexts.⁴ Often realized in terracotta, they were used for their symbolic meaning rather than their practical function. Similarly, figurative decorations of candelabra, mirrors and fine pottery were inspired by athletic competitions and life in the palaestra.⁵



Fig. 1 Lanuvium, Funerary set of a warrior.

In conclusion, in ancient Italy the adoption of the Greek gymnasium was one of the most common tools for becoming Greek, in addition to the adoption of the language, the social behaviors and the material culture. In many cases, this phenomenon can also include the appropriation of the typical Greek institution connected with the *paideia*, such as the Gymnasium. The modalities and the aims, both political and cultural, that justified this choice varied and must be evaluated individually, as they depend on the contexts.

This paper examines several case studies in two different cultural contexts, notably the Brettian city of Petelia and the Samnite cities of Abella, Pompeii, and Cuma. It will be comparatively assessed how the elite of these cities adopted the concept of the Greek Gymnasium, whether they fully embraced the gymnasium as both an institution and building type, or selectively emulated only certain features.⁶

1 Lombardo 2006.

2 For an overview on the topic, see Thuillier 1985; Thuillier 1995; Guzzo 2006. In addition, see the papers gathered in Thuillier 1993.

3 On the tomb see Zevi 1993 with further bibliography.

4 See Thuillier 1989. For the presence of strigils in graves as a sign of Hellenization in Campania see Johannowsky 1976, 269.

5 See, for example, the materials gathered in Bianco 2002; Bruschetti 2002;

Moretti 2003.

6 While the terms gymnasium and palaestra are commonly clearly distinguished in literature, this differentiation is not important here; therefore, the term gymnasium will be used indiscriminately to refer to the institution and all buildings that may have belonged to the gymnasium (including the palaestra which is usually identified as a building with peristyle

1 A gymnasium of the Brettii: Petelia

In pre-Roman Italy, the testimonies of gymnasia in non-Greek contexts are few, and they deserve special attention.⁷ The most ancient example was identified in the Brettian center of Petelia, the modern Strongoli on the Ionian coast of Calabria, near Croton. Since the 18th century a Greek inscription has been known, dated to the 3rd/2nd century BC, that records the construction of a stoa pertaining to the local gymnasium under the gymnasiarchy of the brothers Minatos Krittios Matilas and Markos Krittios, both sons of Minatos.⁸ The works were funded by *koina chremata*, public money. The binomial shape of the onomastic formula, typical of the Italic tradition, reveals the Oscan origin of the two brothers.⁹ The presence of the gymnasiarchy, strongly linked to the *ephebeia*, shows that the education of the youths at Petelia followed the model of the Greek *paideia*.¹⁰

At the time of the inscription, the Italic aristocracy of Petelia desired to present their city as a Greek polis. Greek identity was created through a foundation myth that linked the origins of the city to the Greek hero Philoctetes.¹¹ Additionally, the use of Greek in public and private inscriptions provides important evidence.¹²

The Osco-Greek bilingualism of the Bruttii is known also thanks to a gloss by Festus.¹³ The author explains the expression *bilingues Bruttaces*, ascribed to Ennius, and says that the Bruttian people used to speak both Oscan and Greek. Another element that testifies the cultural interactions between Greeks and Bruttii in Petelia is the inclusion of the city in the lists of the *theorodokoi* of Epidaurus (ca. 350 BC), of Kos (242 BC) and Delphi (198–194 BC).¹⁴

In spite of this deep Hellenization, the Bruttii were perceived as barbarians by Greek people. According to Livy,¹⁵ during the Second Punic War, the Carthaginian

general Hannon suggested to the Crotonians to repopulate their destroyed city with a Bruttian colony; the Crotonians, however, refused and answered that they would prefer to die, rather than mix with the Bruttii.

2 The Gymnasia of the Samnites

2.1 Abella

Another case study, in a different geographic and cultural context, is Abella, the modern Avella. This Oscan center, located between Hirpinian Samnium and Campania, also provided a gymnasium in the 2nd century BC, as proven by an inscribed base found in 1984 near the Forum.¹⁶ The inscription mentions Maius Vestirikius, a local magistrate already known from other inscriptions (i.e. the Cippus Abellanus¹⁷), as sponsor of some urban ornaments. He offered several objects that belong to a homogeneous group: *segunu perissty* (translated as statues in the peristyle), *batrùm tuvffud* (a tuff base), and *bravùs* (probably corresponding to Latin *brutus*).¹⁸ Mario Torelli convincingly argued that *bravùs* was a stone *Telamon*, the support of a table (*trapeza*) used in award ceremonies.¹⁹

All the objects listed in the inscription fit well with the equipment of a gymnasium. Scholars agree in translating the Oscan term *perissty* with the Greek *peristylon*:²⁰ this grecism has been used to refer to a Greek-type building, such as a gymnasium or *palaestra*.

2.2 Pompeii

A different example comes from Oscan Pompeii, where we have a gymnasium with its decoration. This building, the so-called Samnite *Palaestra*, is located in the Quarter

courtyard and surrounding rooms).

7 For Sicilian examples, see M. Trümper in this volume.

8 IG XIV, 637; Costabile 1984; Intrieri and Zumbo 1995, 266, n. B4; Cordiano 1997, 63–65, M; Ampolo 2008; Poccetti 2014, 108 n. 7.

9 Poccetti 2014, 84.

10 Near Petelia the gymnasiarchy is attested at Rhegion, see Cordiano 1997, 65–69, N.

11 For a useful collection of literary sources about Petelia, see Attianese 2003, 11–18.

12 On the phenomenon of bilingualism in Petelia see Lazzarini 2011; Poccetti 2014.

13 Paul. *Fest.* 31 L: *Bilingues Bruttaces Ennius dixit quod Bruttii et Osce et*

Graece loqui soliti sunt.

14 Medaglia 2015, 28, 30, 33–36. For a basic introduction to this topic, see Manganaro 1964.

15 Livy Epit. XXIV, 3, 11.

16 Cinquantaquattro and Pescatori Colucci 2013, 17.

17 Cinquantaquattro and Pescatori Colucci 2013, 20–25 with different translations and a complete bibliography.

18 In Antonini 1996: side a. *maiieís.staattieís.p[/ ním.segúnú.perissty[/ batrúm.tavffúd.st[/ ísídum.prúfatte[d.¿]*; side b. *jvestirikiis.[.i]/ m.bravús[/]-ú.íním[.]*

19 Torelli 1996, 674.

20 MacDonald 2015.

of the Theaters and is strongly linked with the Sanctuary of Athena at the Foro Triangolare.²¹ The building consists of a central rectangular courtyard, surrounded by porticoes on three sides only (Pl. 1).

Based on archaeological excavations and architectural features, the building has been dated to the second half of the 2nd century BC (Pl. 2, 1).²²

The asymmetric plan results from modifications carried out after the earthquake of AD 62. At this point, the fourth side of the peristyle was removed, reducing the size of the building by a quarter (Pl. 2, 2).

In this last phase, three small rooms opened on the west side: in the northern room, the traces of a staircase prove the existence of a second floor. Thanks to the new drawings by the architect Luigi Tricarico, it is possible to distinguish two different phases.²³ Originally, there was a single room opened on the peristyle. This room looks like an exedra and can be identified with the ephebeum that, according to Vitruvius (Vitr. 11.2), was the largest and most important room of the palaestra,²⁴ intended for meetings and the education of the youth. The current shape of this exedra, subdivided by an L-shape wall, is the result of a Neronian intervention.²⁵

Evidence of sculptural decoration was discovered in the peristyle: a tuff base with a small altar and a staircase, one of the best-preserved copies of the so-called Doryphoros of Polykleitos;²⁶ a marble basin with a support, which has now disappeared. It might also be that a couple of herms in Cipollino marble, walled up in the Sacarium of the adjacent Iseum, belonged to the sculptural decoration of the building.²⁷ According to excavation diaries, several inscriptions, most of them lost, were found in the building,²⁸ among them the famous Oscan inscription Vetter 11.²⁹ This inscription records the will of Vibius Adiranus, who funded the local vereiia. With

his bequest, the quaestor (kvaistur) Vibius Vinicius, with the cooperation of the Town Council (kumbennieis), constructed this public building (triibum ekak).

This inscription provides a key element to explaining the word vereiia. The term appears only in Oscan epigraphic evidence and, therefore, the vereiia seems to have been an entirely Italic institution. Recently, it has been argued that the vereiia was the Oscan equivalent of the Greek ephebeia and of the Latin iuventus.³⁰ Ephebeia and iuventus were known as institutions presiding over the rites of passages between childhood and adulthood. Previously, this interpretation was neglected in the scholarly debate and, for a long time, scholars preferred the idea that the vereiia was the Samnite cavalry, as suggested by A. La Regina.³¹

2.3 Cuma

New evidence to support this hypothesis comes from Cuma, a city of Greek origin but conquered by the Samnites in 421 BC. It is interesting to observe that, after the conquest of the city, the Samnites adopted some Hellenic traditions, such as the education system that followed the model of the Greek paideia. Since the 4th century BC, the transformation of the funerary practices reveals that the Cuman society adopted funeral customs with a reference to the Greek gymnasium.³² In the composition of the funeral sets, the strigil appeared for the first time in association with balsamaria and unguentaria.³³ In the 3rd century BC, the weapons disappeared and strigils continued to be used, often with suspension rings, symbol of athletic and military training of the dead.³⁴

This social importance of athletic training is also reflected in the construction of a stadium recently dis-

21 For new considerations about the cults in this sanctuary, see with different positions Osanna 2015; Avagliano 2016.

22 For the chronology of the building see Carandini, Carafa, and D'Alessio 2001, 122, 127; Carafa 2005, 31–35.

23 Tricarico 2013.

24 In Vitruvius, this word refers to the whole gymnasium. Instead, in Greek period palaestra was only a part of the building, including the peristyle with the rooms for athletic training. For the debate on this topic, see Pettenò 1999.

25 Carafa 2005, 31–35.

26 For a reinterpretation of this sculpture with a shield and a sword, respectively carried on the left and right hand, see Franciosi 2004.

27 As suggested in Pesando 2000, 168.

28 On the inscriptions found in the building, see Avagliano 2013, 73–75.

29 Vetter 1953, 49–50 n. 11; Morandi 1982, 123–124 n. 27; Poccetti 1982.

The text is the following: v. aadirans v. etiuvam paam / vereiiaí púmpai-ianaí tristaa- / mentud deded eísak etiuvad / v. viínikiís mr. kvaistur pú- / mpaiians trífbúm ekak kúmben- / nieís tanginud úpsannam / deded ísf-dum prúfatted. Translation: The money, which Vibius Adiranus son of Vibius gave in his will for the vereiia of Pompeii, with this money Vibius Vinicius son of Maras, quaestor of Pompeii, commissioned the construction of this building by the decree of the council. He himself approved it.

30 Camodeca 2012, 243–244; Avagliano 2013, 94–101.

31 La Regina 1981.

32 Greco 2015, 354.

33 Valenza Mele 1990, 26–27.

34 Valenza Mele 1990, 26–27.

covered near the Cuman city walls (3rd/2nd century BC).³⁵ Between the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 1st BC, on one of the bleachers of the building a tribunal composed by two platforms was constructed, probably meant to host the panel of judges and award ceremony of the athletes.³⁶ On the superior platform a base with an inscription was placed, probably supporting a bronze tripod, which has disappeared today.³⁷ The inscription (second half of 2nd century BC) mentions Maius Calovius, whose title *m.v. ínim m. x* is generally read as *meddix vereiias*, the ‘magistrate of the vereiia,’ and ‘meddix decem’ a member of a collegium of ten people, whose functions are not clear.³⁸ He dedicated a statue (*segnum*) to a God, whose name is only partially preserved. According to Giuseppe Camodeca, it is possible to make out *Pid-*, probably for the latin God *Fidius*.³⁹

Another location connected to the vereiia is that of the Central Baths of Cuma, where an inscribed labrum of Pentelic marble dedicated by a *meddix vereiias* was discovered in 1975.⁴⁰ The presence of this kind of furniture in thermal space is relevant. It is not possible to clarify whether the labrum that dates to between the end of 3rd and the 2nd century BC belonged to the original decoration of the baths, which were built at the beginning of the 2nd century BC.⁴¹ In any case, the labrum was included in the baths, when the building was renovated in the Augustan age. In this period, at least, the Central Baths might have also been frequented by members of the vereiia.⁴² It is perhaps of interest to recall that also at Pompeii a connection between the Republican Baths and the Samnite Palaestra, headquarter of the vereiia, has been hypothesized, due to the proximity of the buildings.⁴³

Cuma is the city with the richest epigraphic corpus

of the vereiia. In addition to the cases already discussed, we must mention: firstly, the *cocciopesto* floor of the Forum temple (later the Capitolium) containing an inscription⁴⁴ with the name of the *meddix vereiias* Minius Heius, son of Pacius, belonging to the gens Heia (like the person who donated the labrum); secondly, an inscribed base with the dedication of a statue to Iuppiter Flagius on behalf of the local vereiia (*pro vereiiad*), by an unknown *meddix vereias*.⁴⁵

The wide range of interventions reveals that this institution, directed by the local aristocracy, played an important role in civic life between the 3rd and the 2nd century BC. In this period Cuma was already integrated into the Roman political system, raised to the status of *civitas sine suffragio* in 334 BC (Livy VIII 14.11). Therefore, Rome could have played a role in the revival of vereiia. This hypothesis is based on the cases of Petelia, Neapolis, Elea-Velia and many centers in Sicily, where gymnasial institutions were revived under Roman rule.⁴⁶ In the case of Elea-Velia, for example, Cornelius Gemellius of the tribus Romilia was gymnasiarch on three occasions, as recorded in a Latin inscription that dates to the 1st century BC.⁴⁷ In the Roman period gymnasial institutions seems to have been used as instruments to reinforce the loyalty of Italic allies. In this perspective the buildings linked with vereiia (the Oscan equivalent of *ephebeia*), both at Pompeii and Cuma, acquired a special interest, still in Roman period. At Pompeii, in spite of the construction of the Great Palaestra, a new modern building for the local *iuventus*, the old Samnite Palaestra was totally refurbished in the Augustan period.⁴⁸ At a certain point, the Central Baths of Cuma, recently renovated, included a labrum funded by a member of vereiia.

35 Giglio 2015, on the chronology see in particular 82–83.

36 Giglio 2015.

37 Camodeca 2012. According to the scholar, the text is: *maí(s) kalúvis úf(falleís) m(eddís) v(ereias) ínim m(eddís) x ekík segnúm pid[—]d[—] + ú[-dunúm] deded*. Translation: Maius Kaluvius, son of Offelius, meddix of the vereiia and decemvir, gave this statue to Fidius(?).

38 On this problem see more recently Camodeca 2012, 241–242 with previous debate.

39 Camodeca 2012, 241; see also Giglio 2015, 70. According to Camodeca, probably the Oscan P stands for Latin F.

40 Sgobbo 1977, 256–257 pl. X–XI; Volpicella 2006–2007, 213–214 fig. 15. The inscription reads as follows: *ma. hefís de(kkieís) m(eddís) v(ereias) ínim m(eddís) x ekák fliteam emmens*. Translation: Ma(mercus) Heius, son of Decius, meddix of the vereiia and decemvir, bought this labrum.

41 For the phases of the building, see Volpicella 2006–2007.

42 See also Gasparri 2008, 300.

43 Pesando 2002–2003, 239–241; viewed critically by M. Trümper in this

volume.

44 Sgobbo 1977, 249 pl. IX; Poccetti 1981, 96–97, n. 133. The inscription says: *min(is) heí(s) pak(ieís) m(eddís) v(ereias) ínim m(eddís) x ekík pavmentúm úpsannúm dedens*. Translation: Minius Heius, son of Pacius, and the meddix of the vereiia and decemvir, commissioned the construction of this floor. Based on recent excavations (see Petacco and Rescigno 2007, 80–81, 99), this floor has been dated to the first half of 2nd century BC.

45 Poccetti 1981, 95–96 n. 132. The text says: [— 8/10 —] *mr. m(eddís) v(ereias) ínim m(eddís) x ekík se[-]júnúm iúveí flagiúi pr. vereiiad duneís dedens*. Translation: (onomastic formula lost) meddix of the vereiia and decemvir gave this statue as a gift to Jupiter Flagius on behalf of the vereiia. Scholars agree that the inscription date to the 2nd century BC.

46 Ampolo 2008, 27. For Sicilian cases, see Prag 2007, 87–96.


47 Greco 2011–2013, 358.

48 Pesando 2000.


3 Conclusion

In conclusion, although in pre-Roman Italy only few gymnasia can be identified in non-Greek contexts, these are very significant. The spread of the gymnasial institution took place within a specific time span (3rd–2nd century BC), characterized by a global process of Hellenization in the Western Mediterranean. It is not surprising that the phenomenon is parallel to the success of an aristocratic ideology that recognized the value of ath-

letics as a status symbol. However, the approach to this foreign model took different forms. On the one hand, there is Petelia, for a long time in the Crotonian orbit that fully absorbed the gymnasial institution. On the other hand, there is the Samnite world, where, despite a certain degree of Hellenization, the traditional institution of *vereiia* was maintained and the adoption of Greek elements was limited to the types of building and their sculptural decoration.



Pl. 1 Pompeii, Samnite Palaestra, plan.



Pl. 2 1 Pompeii, Samnite Palaestra, axonometric reconstruction of building in the Samnite period; 2 Pompeii, Samnite Palaestra, axonometric reconstruction of the building after AD 62.

Bibliography

Ampolo 2008

Carmine Ampolo. "L'iscrizione del ginnasio di Petelia (IG XIV 637)". *Minima Epigraphica et Papyrologica* XI, fasc. 13 (2008), 23–28.

Antonini 1996

Rosalba Antonini. "Iscrizione del foro (?) di Abella". In *La tavola di Agnone nel contesto italico. Convegno di studio, Agnone 13–15 aprile 1994*. Ed. by L. Del Tutto Palma. Florence: Olschki, 1996, 157–168.

Attianese 2003

Pasquale Attianese. *Petelia: la collezione Luigi E. Romano*. Soveria Mannelli: Rubettino, 2003.

Avagliano 2013

Alessandra Avagliano. "Il ginnasio di Vibio Adirano e la vereia. Con una nota sulla domus publica di Pompei Pompei". In *Messene: il Doriforo e il suo contesto*. Ed. by V. Franciosi and P. Thémelis. Naples: Università degli Studi Suor Orsola Benincasa, 2013, 67–121.

Avagliano 2016

Alessandra Avagliano. "Looking for Herakles at the Slopes of the Vesuvius". *Bulletin antieke beschaving* 91 (2016), 161–162.

Bianco 2002

Salvatore Bianco. *Policoro, Museo archeologico nazionale della siritide, 28 settembre 2002–10 gennaio 2003*. Policoro: Taranto: Scorpione, 2002.

Bruschetti 2002

Paolo Bruschetti. *Lo sport nell'Italia antica: spettacoli e divertimenti nei luoghi umbri ed etruschi*. Perugia: F. Fabbri, 2002.

Camodeca 2012

Giuseppe Camodeca. "L'iscrizione osca". In *Cuma. Le fortificazioni. 3. Lo scavo 2004–2006*. Ed. by Bruno d'Agostino and Marco Giglio. Naples: Direzione regionale per i Beni culturali e paesaggistici della Campania, 2012, 238–245.

Carafa 2005

Paolo Carafa. "Pubblicando la casa di Giuseppe II (VIII, 2, 38–39) e il Foro Triangolare". In *Nuove ricerche archeologiche a Pompei ed Ercolano*. Ed. by P. G. Guzzo and M. P. Guidobaldi. Rome: Electa, 2005, 19–35.

Carandini, Carafa, and D'Alessio 2001

Andrea Carandini, Paolo Carafa, and Maria Teresa D'Alessio. "Nuovi progetti, nuove domande, nuovi metodi". In *Pompei Scienza e Società. 250° Anniversario degli Scavi di Pompei*. Ed. by P. G. Guzzo. Milano: Electa, 2001, 127–129.

Cinquantaquattro and Pescatori Colucci 2013

Teresa Cinquantaquattro and Gabriella Pescatori Colucci. *Regio I: Avella, Atripalda, Salerno*. Fana, templa, delubra: 2. Rome: Quasar, 2013.

Cordiano 1997

Federica Cordiano. *La ginnasiarchia nelle 'poleis' dell'Occidente mediterraneo antico*. Pisa: ETS, 1997.

Costabile 1984

Felice Costabile. "I ginnasiarchi a Petelia". *Archivio storico per la Calabria e la Lucania* 51 (1984), 5–15.

Franciosi 2004

Vincenzo Franciosi. "Il Doriforo di Policeto. Un'indagine filologica a 140 anni dall'identificazione". *Eidola* 1 (2004), 61–89.

Gasparri 2008

Carlo Gasparri. "La romanizzazione. Gli Heii, una grande famiglia cumana". In *Museo Archeologico dei Campi Flegrei. Catalogo Generale*. Ed. by F. Zevi. Cuma: Electa, 2008, 300–301.

Giglio 2015

Marco Giglio. *Lo stadio di Cuma*. Naples: Università degli studi di Napoli, 2015.

Greco 2015

Giovanna Greco. "Processi di trasformazione nel corso del III secolo a.C.: Cuma ed Elea". In *La Magna Grecia da Pirro ad Annibale*. Istituto per la storia e l'archeologia della Magna Grecia. Taranto: Istituto per la storia e l'archeologia della Magna Grecia, 2015, 337–404.

Greco 2011–2013

Giovanna Greco. "Intorno ad un ginnasio a Elea-Velia". *Rendiconti dell'Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e Belle Arti* 76 (2011–2013), 345–365.

Guzzo 2006

Pier Giovanni Guzzo. "Alle origini dell'atletismo italico e romano". In *Eroi e atleti: l'ideale estetico nell'arte da Olimpia a Roma a Torino*. Ed. by A. M. Reggiani and M. Sapelli Ragni. Torino: Allemandi, 2006, 55–63.

Intrieri and Zumbo 1995

Maria Intrieri and Antonio Zumbo. *I Brettii. II, Fonti letterarie ed epigrafiche*. Soveria Mannelli: Rubettino, 1995.

Johannowsky 1976

Werner Johannowsky. "La situazione in Campania". In *Hel-lenismus in Mittelitalien: Kolloquium in Göttingen vom 5. bis 9. Juni 1974*. Ed. by P. Zanker. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1976, 267–288.

La Regina 1981

Adriano La Regina. "Appunti su entità etniche e strutture istituzionali nel Sannio antico". *Annali di archeologia e storia antica* 3 (1981), 129–137.

Lazzarini 2011

Maria Letizia Lazzarini. "Interazioni culturali tra Greci e Brettii: l'epigrafia di Petelia". In *Enotri e Brettii in Magna Grecia: modi e forme di interazione culturale*. Ed. by G. De Sensi Sestito and S. Mancuso. Soveria Mannelli: Rubettino, 2011, 595–600.

Lombardo 2006

Mario Lombardo. "I paradossi dell'ellenizzazione da Pirro ad Annibale: ideologie e pratiche 'ellenizzanti' nell'Italia meridionale di fronte all'espansione romana". *Pallas* 70 (2006), 15–26.

MacDonald 2015

Katherine MacDonald. *Oscan in Southern Italy and Sicily: Evaluating Language Contact in a Fragmentary Corpus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Manganaro 1964

Giacomo Manganaro. "Città di Sicilia e santuari panellenici nel III e II sec. a.C.". *Historia. Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 13 (1964), 413–439.

Medaglia 2015

Salvatore Medaglia. "Dal viaggio dei theoroi di Epidauro a quello dei theoroi delfici. Il Bruzio nelle liste dei theorodokoi (IG, IV 1504 = IG, IV 2 1, 95 e SGDI, 2580 = BCH 45, 1921, 1–85)". In *Le voyage à Crotone: découvrir la Calabre de l'Antiquité à nos jours. Proceedings of an international colloquium organized by l'Unité d'archéologie classique du Département des sciences de l'Antiquité, Université de Genève, 11 May 2014*. Ed. by L. E. Baumer, P. B. Emery, and M. Campagnolo. Bern: Peter Lang, 2015, 21–49.

Morandi 1982

Alessandro Morandi. *Epigrafia italica*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1982.

Moretti 2003

Anna Maria Moretti. *Lo sport nell'Italia antica: immagini nel percorso del museo*. Rome: Ingegneria per la cultura, gruppo Zètema, 2003.

Osanna 2015

Massimo Osanna. "Sanctuaries and Cults in Pre-Roman Pompeii". In *Greek Colonisation: New Data, Current Approaches. Proceedings of the Scientific Meeting Held in Thessaloniki (6 February 2015)*. Athens: Alpha Bank, 2015, 71–89.

Pesando 2000

Fabrizio Pesando. "Edifici pubblici 'antichi' nella Pompei augustea: il caso della Palestra Sannitica". *Römische Mitteilungen* 107 (2000), 15–175.

Pesando 2002–2003

Fabrizio Pesando. "Le terme repubblicane di Pompei". *Cronologia e funzione, Annali di archeologia e storia antica* 9–10 (2002–2003), 221–243.

Petacco and Rescigno 2007

Laura Petacco and Carlo Rescigno. "I Saggi sul Capitolium e il settore occidentale della piazza forense". In *Cuma. Il foro. Scavi dell'Università di Napoli Federico II, 2000–2001*. Quaderni del Centro Studi Magna Grecia 5, Studi Cumani 1. Pozzuoli: Naus, 2007, 77–117.

Pettenò 1999

Elena Pettenò. "Vitruvio e la grecità. Una proposta di rilettura del brano V, 11 del (De Architectura)". *Revue Archéologique* (1999), 3–34.

Poccetti 1981

Paolo Poccetti. *Nuovi documenti italici a complemento del Manuale di E. Vetter*. Pisa: Giardini, 1981.

Poccetti 1982

Paolo Poccetti. "Il testamento di Vibio Adirano". *Rendiconti dell'Accademia di archeologia, lettere e belle arti, Napoli* 57 (1982), 237–245.

Poccetti 2014

Paolo Poccetti. "Bilingues Bruttaces. Il plurilinguismo di una città della Magna Grecia attraverso i suoi testi: il caso di Petelia". In *Le lingue dell'Italia antica oltre il latino: lasciare parlare i testi*. Ed. by R. Giacomelli and A. Robbiati Bianchi. Milano: Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere, 2014, 73–109.

Prag 2007

Jonathan Prag. "Auxilia and Gymnasia. A Sicilian Model of Roman Imperialism". *The Journal of Roman studies* XCVII (2007), 68–100.

Sgobbo 1977

Italo Sgobbo. "Il maggior tempio del Foro di Cuma e la munificenza degli Heii cumani in epoca sannitica". *Rendiconti dell'Accademia di archeologia, lettere e belle arti, Napoli* LII (1977), 231–264.

Thuillier 1985

Jean-Paul Thuillier. *Les jeux athlétiques dans la civilisation étrusque*. Rome: Ecole française, 1985.

Thuillier 1989

Jean-Paul Thuillier. "Les strigiles de l'Italie antique". *Revue archéologique* (1989), 339–342.

Thuillier 1993

Jean-Paul Thuillier, ed. *Spectacles sportifs et scéniques dans le monde étrusco-italique. Actes de la table ronde de Rome (3–4 mai 1991)*. Rome: École Française de Rome, 1993.

Thuillier 1995

Jean-Paul Thuillier. "Les jeux étrusques. Hellenisation et hellénocentrisme". *Caesarodunum* 29 (1995), 213–219.

Torelli 1996

Mario Torelli. "Intervento nella relazione Antonini". In *La tavola di Agnone nel contesto italico. Convegno di studio, Agnone 13–15 aprile 1994*. Ed. by Loretta Del Tutto Palma. Florence: Olschki, 1996, 674.

Tricarico 2013

Luigi Tricarico. "La Palestra Sannitica: rilievo e analisi tecnica delle strutture". In *Pompei/Messene: il Doriforo e il suo contesto*. Ed. by V. Franciosi and P. Thémelis. Naples: Università degli Studi Suor Orsola Benincasa, 2013, 51–62.

Valenza Mele 1990

Nazarena Valenza Mele. "La necropoli di Cuma: il superamento della comunità primitiva". In *Italici in Magna Grecia. Lingua, insediamenti e strutture*. Ed. by M. Tagliente. Venosa: Osanna, 1990, 23–33.

Vetter 1953

Emil Vetter. *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1953.

Volpicella 2006–2007

Daria Volpicella. “Cuma. Le Terme Centrali: un preliminare inquadramento cronologico delle fasi edilizie”. *Annali dell’Istituto universitario orientale di Napoli. Dipartimento di studi del mondo classico e del Mediterraneo antico. Sezione di archeologia e storia antica* 13–14 (s.n.) (2006–2007), 197–220.

Zevi 1993

Fausto Zevi. “La Tomba del guerriero di Lanuvio”. In *Spectacles sportifs et scéniques dans le monde étrusco-italique. Actes de la table ronde, Rome 3–4 mai 1991*. Rome: Ecole française, 1993, 409–442.

Illustration and plate credits

ILLUSTRATIONS: 1 Copyright 2012 Fotosar – Mibact – Soprintendenza Speciale per i Beni Archeologici di Roma.

PLATES: 1 Tricarico 2013, pl. II. 2 Tricarico 2013, pl. XIII.

ALESSANDRA AVAGLIANO

PhD (Roma La Sapienza 2014), is a Postdoctoral Researcher at the Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen. Her research focuses on the archaeology of Pre-Roman Campania (particularly Pompeii), and Hellenistic and Roman figurative culture. She took part in archaeological excavations (Pompeii) and in the cataloguing of private and public collections (Musei Capitolini, Rome). She is currently involved in a research project on the roman cities of ancient Hirpinia (inner Campania).

Dr. Alessandra Avagliano
Institut für Klassische Archäologie
Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen
Schloss Hohentübingen
Burgsteige 11
72070 Tübingen, Germany
E-Mail: alessandravagliano@gmail.com

RICCARDO MONTALBANO

is currently PhD Student (Ca’ Foscari University of Venice and Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen). He studied Classical Archaeology and Ancient Topography (La Sapienza Rome) and specialized in GIS and Landscape Archaeology (University of Southampton). His research focuses on ancient roman urbanism, particularly in Rome. He worked on the field in Italy (Rome, Tivoli, Piazza Armerina) and is currently the GIS-expert for the Italian excavation of Pompeiopolis (Turkey).

Riccardo Montalbano
Institut für Klassische Archäologie
Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen
Schloss Hohentübingen
Burgsteige 11
72070 Tübingen, Germany
E-Mail: ricca.montalbano@gmail.com

Monika Trümper

Gymnasium, Palaestra, Campus and Bathing in Late Hellenistic Pompeii: A Reassessment of the Urban Context of the Republican Baths (VIII 5, 36)

Summary

The Foro Triangolare area is commonly identified as the site of an athletic-military complex of Late Hellenistic Samnite Pompeii. While the denomination (gymnasium, campus, palaestra of the vereia) and extension of this complex are debated, the Republican Baths are unanimously interpreted as an integral conceptual and functional part of it. This paper critically reassesses this assumption, based on recent research in the Republican Baths (Topoi C-6-8 project, 2015–2017). It is argued that the highly fashionable Republican Baths with their separate sections for men and women were not conceived at public initiative for exclusive use by Samnite male and female youths, but instead were built in the 2nd century BC by a private person as a profitable business investment for a broad paying clientele.

Keywords: Pompeii; Foro Triangolare; gymnasium; campus; Samnite Palaestra; Republican Baths

Das Foro Triangolare wird gewöhnlich als Ort eines athletisch-militärischen Komplexes im späthellenistischen Samnitischen Pompeji identifiziert. Benennung (gymnasium, campus, palaestra der vereia) und Ausdehnung sind zwar umstritten, aber die Republikanischen Thermen werden einmütig als integraler konzeptioneller und funktioneller Bestandteil dieses Komplexes gedeutet. Dieser Beitrag untersucht kritisch diese These, basierend auf neuen Forschungen (Topoi C-6-8 Projekt, 2015–2017). Es wird gezeigt, dass die Republikanischen Thermen

mit separaten Trakten für Männer und Frauen nicht auf öffentliche Initiative für exklusive Nutzung durch die samnitische Jugend konzipiert, sondern im 2. Jh. v. Chr. von privater Hand als profitables Investment für eine breite, zahlende Klientel errichtet wurden.

Keywords: Pompeji; Foro Triangolare; Gymnasium; Campus; Samnitische Palaestra; Republikanische Thermen

First of all, I would like to thank all persons and institutions that made research and fieldwork in Pompeii possible: the Parco Archeologico di Pompei with the Direttore Generale Massimo Osanna and his colleagues; the Excellence Cluster Topoi in Berlin, particularly the members of the research groups C-6 on Cityscaping and A-3 on Water Management; the research team of the project Topoi C-6-8 on Cityscaping and Bathing Culture in Ancient Italy, which includes Clemens Brünenberg, Jens-Arne Dickmann, Domenico Esposito, Antonio Ferrandes, Jennifer Hagen, Thomas Heide, Alexander Hoer, Dominik Lengyel, Giacomo Pardini, Cees Passchier, Alessandra Pegurri, Jennifer Robinson, Mark Robinson, Christoph Rummel, Gül Sürmelihiindi, Catherine Toulouse, and Kai Wellbrock; and all students who participated and whom I cannot list by name here. While this article is based on collaborative research of this project, which I would like to acknowledge most gratefully, all errors are mine.

The area of the Foro Triangolare in Pompeii in the Pre-Roman period, thus before 80 BC, is often identified as a complex of complementary buildings that were closely connected with athletic and military activities. Therefore, the complex would have served as a predecessor of the Great Palaestra in Pompeii, built in the Augustan period. Samnite youths, assembled in the *vereiia*, would have trained in the Foro Triangolare complex, whereas the Roman equivalent, the *iuventus*, later would have frequented the Great Palaestra. While not all scholars agree upon the extension of the athletic-military compound, a maximum list of buildings that have been assigned to it includes: the Foro Triangolare with a three-sided covered race-track (*porticus*) and a single open-air race-track in the east; the Quadriporticus behind the Great Theater, serving as a gymnasium for older youths; the Palaestra Sannitica used as training site for young boys or the *vereiia* in general; a building adjacent to the Foro Triangolare, either the lot VIII 6,5 or the Casa di Giuseppe II (VIII 2, 38–39), identified as the *Domus Publica* where military census and levy actions, especially of equestrians, took place and a selected group of soldiers stayed; and the Republican Baths (VIII 5, 36), a typical public Roman-style bath building with separate sections for men and women (Pl. 1).¹

The whole complex or some of its individual elements have variously been referred to as palaestra, gymnasium, and campus, and comparisons have been drawn with palaestrae and gymnasia in the Greek Hellenistic world as well as with *campi* in the western Mediterranean (Italy and Roman provinces).

All of these structures of the Pompeian complex have, at some point, been dated to the 2nd century BC, even if the construction date of crucial features is not unanimously agreed upon. The contemporaneity or the exact chronological sequence of these structures cannot be determined, however. While the buildings

do not form a coherent architectural ensemble and are even separated by streets and located at different levels, functional coherence is still assumed, suggesting some kind of urban master plan that transformed a formerly sparsely built area into a densely built athletic-military complex.² The complex would have developed at the margins of the walled city, but in close vicinity of an important Archaic cult site, notably the sanctuary of Minerva (and possibly Hercules).³

Even if the precise identity and importance of the main users of this complex, the Pompeian *vereiia*, remain debated, most recently it has been defined as a public institution with military vocation that was headed by a magistrate and that was equivalent to the Attic *ephebeia* and the Latin *iuventus*.⁴ In the Samnite period, members of the *vereiia* would have been granted sole use of at least three of the buildings, namely the *Domus Publica*, the Palaestra Sannitica, and the Republican Baths.⁵ It is commonly not discussed, however, how access to and circulation in the other spaces of the complex could be controlled, whether any of them could have been closed off, at least temporarily, for exclusive use by training athletes.⁶

The question of users arises particularly for the Republican Baths that include two separate sections, one of them commonly assigned to women, which seems to be at odds with the concept of a male-dominated urban area. Noticing this alleged contradiction, F. Pesando has argued that the Samnites provided athletic training and subsequent bathing for both aristocratic boys and girls. While nothing is concretely known about the cultural practices and habits of the population in Late Hellenistic Pompeii, the Samnites in general would have had a particular cultural affinity to Spartans, sharing with them certain progressive concepts of social behavior and of the role of women.⁷ This is quite critical though with

1 The discussion was most recently summarized by De Waele 2001, 328–332; Borlenghi 2011, 217–219; and Avagliano 2013 with full bibliography; for military use of the complex see especially Pesando 1997; Pesando 2000; Pesando 2002–2003, 239–243; Pesando, Tosti, and Zanella 2010, 149–154, esp. 151; Coarelli 2001, 102; Carafa 2011, 98 n. 36; Avagliano 2013, 84 n. 87.

2 This central question is only explicitly discussed by Pesando 2002–2003, 240 n. 47, who assumes public initiative at least for the buildings with military connotation. The only buildings predating the 2nd century BC are the Doric Temple, dated to 6th century BC, and possibly the Great Theater, whose origins are sometimes dated to the Samnite era, although it would have been completely rebuilt in the 2nd century BC.

3 Avagliano 2016; Avagliano 2017 strongly argued against a veneration of

Hercules in the Foro Triangolare.

4 Avagliano 2013, 94–101, esp. 101 with detailed discussion; slightly different e.g. Coarelli 2002, 81: politisch-militärische Adelsorganisation (equites Campani).

5 Most emphatically argued by Pesando 2000; Pesando 2002–2003; but followed e.g. by Avagliano 2013, 82.

6 The propylon of the Foro Triangolare could be closed with two doors, but the area was also accessible from the east, via the Great Theater and the Quadriporticus; De Waele 2001, 318 fig. 413.

7 This is only discussed in Pesando 2002–2003, 241–242; it is not mentioned any further by Borlenghi 2011, 217–219, and Avagliano 2007; Avagliano 2013.

view to the supposed military character of the whole complex, and one wonders why spatial segregation only would have been implemented in the baths, but not in any other facility ascribed to the complex.

The Republican Baths are particularly critical to the theory of an athletic-military complex. While attribution of some of its elements has recently been challenged, the central trio of Domus Publica, Palaestra Sannitica, and Republican Baths is firmly maintained as conclusive evidence of the existence of a socially exclusive vereia in Late Hellenistic Samnite Pompeii. It is the aim of this paper to reassess the urban context and significance of the Republican Baths, as well as the theory of a coherent athletic-military complex or of the gymnasium-campus. The argument is based upon recent research of this little known bath building that investigates the history, development, function, and urban context of the lot VIII 5, 36. In the following, each of the structures assigned to the athletic-military complex is briefly discussed, providing an assessment of recent research and remaining problems and questions.⁸ Focus is on the Pre-Roman, Late Hellenistic period when the complex was presumably designed, whereas the development in later periods is only mentioned when relevant for the argumentation. Furthermore, buildings, which are located in this quarter, but have no immediate connection to or function with the athletic-military complex must be omitted.⁹ The conclusion will show that the Republican Baths cannot substantiate the theory of an athletic-military complex and should be taken from the list of safe proofs.

1 Foro Triangolare

The use of the three-sided porticus as a covered race-track – either only of its eastern branch or of all three sides, turning twice somewhat awkwardly around the corner – cannot not be proven nor refuted. The most conclusive evidence seems to be a low north-south ori-

ented wall that runs parallel to the eastern porticus and delineates an open-air corridor of about 7 m width (Fig. 1).

While this wall has been identified as a temenos boundary,¹⁰ there are no corresponding walls on the other three sides of the open square around the Doric temple, which would efficiently close off the entire sacred area. The wall comes very close to the temple, especially its south-east corner, and the open race-track would have impeded accessibility to the temple from the east, but it includes at least one opening right next to the south-east corner of the temple.¹¹ With view to the location and orientation of the temple, the wall and adjacent eastern portico seem like a compromise, severely limiting the temple and structures in front of it (tholos, altars), while clearly regulating any kind of movement that occurred in the area around the temple.

The potential use of the Foro Triangolare for athletic training crucially depends upon the dating of its various structures. Based on the material, typology, and style of the Doric tufa colonnade and on the notion of a monumentalizing program for the entire quarter, the porticoes traditionally have been dated to the 2nd century BC. Excavations in the eastern portico and the northwestern corner of the portico yielded findings that provoked the reconstruction of a significantly different scenario. From about 130 BC to AD 62, the area would only have been bordered by the low wall in the east and by a series of small rooms (tabernae) in the north that opened to the temenos in the south.¹² The porticoes and Ionic propylon would only have been erected after AD 62 when the area was definitely no longer used for any athletic purposes. A compromise between the two different dates – 2nd century BC versus post AD 62 – was briefly discussed, dating the tabernae to about 130–100 BC and a first portico, of which no trace survives except for its later reused architectural elements, to about 100 BC. This was, however, obviously quickly abandoned in favor of the late date of the portico.¹³

8 This is not the place for detailed descriptions and arguments, which can easily be derived from literature cited in the following notes; the most recent synthetic assessment of the state of research on this complex is provided by Avagliano 2013.

9 These include the Doric temple, the Great Theater, the Odeum, and the sanctuaries of Isis and Aesculapius.

10 Reference in De Waele 2001, 315 n. 649; similarly Carafa 2011, 96.

11 The plan De Waele 2001, 8 pl. 3 shows only this one opening, of almost 4 m width. The wall includes several spolia, among them the tufa base of

an Ionic or Corinthian column.

12 While the reconstructed phase plan in Carandini, Carafa, and D'Alessio 2001, 126 fig. 1, and Carafa 2005, 24 fig. 7, shows a narrow entrance between the tabernae that allowed for access from the northern square and street to the temenos, the plan in Carafa 2011, 96 fig. 6, shows an uninterrupted series of tabernae; the only entrance to the temenos would have been the staircase from the theater area in the east.

13 Carafa 2005, 25 n. 9 mentions this compromise reached in a discussion with F. Coarelli, but does not discuss it any further in this article, and in




Fig. 1 Pompeii, Foro Triangolare, state plan.

Since the soundings have never been fully published, including all of the conclusive data, no informed decision can be made at this point.¹⁴

In general, the traditional dating of the porticoes in the (late) 2nd century BC seems more reasonable; even if not necessarily contemporaneous, Palaestra and porticoes seem to belong to the same concept because otherwise the orientation of the west wall of the Palaestra would be hard to explain: it is not parallel with or per-

pendicular to the other external walls of the Palaestra and of the adjacent Iseum, but instead follows the orientation of the east portico of the Foro Triangolare.¹⁵ If an Oscan inscription that records the dedication of a porticus (or pastas?) by the meddix publicus V. Popidius V. (f.) referred to the three-sided portico or entrance portico of the Foro Triangolare, as tentatively proposed by Pesando, this would confirm construction of these structures before 80 BC. The inscribed limestone block

Carafa 2011, 95–100 determinedly refers only to the late date of the porticoes. For literature on the debate, see Pesando 2002–2003, 240 n. 46; Avagliano 2007, 150 n. 59–60; Avagliano 2013, 81 n. 72.

- 14 Avagliano 2013, 80–81 evades taking any clear position, although she argues that the tabernae coexisted with the Palaestra Sannitica while firmly maintaining the general notion of an athletic-military training complex in the Foro Triangolare area. While the various plans and sections published in Carafa 2005, 26–27 figs. 9–10; 32 fig. 21; 34 fig. 22, do not show the relationship between the walls of the tabernae and the west wall of the Palaestra Sannitica, the photo Carafa 2005, 23 fig. 6 demonstrates that one of the deep trenches immediately to the west of the Palaestra wall cut the tabernae; since the phases, enumerated in Carafa 2005, 31 and 33 are not correlated with the US numbers shown on the section drawings, 26–27 figs. 10–12, the argumentation is hard to follow. The easternmost taberna is reconstructed right at the location of the southwestern entrance of the Palaestra Sannitica, which seems strange, at best, suggesting that the Palaestra and tabernae never coexisted. While the doorjamb

of this entrance were heavily restored after the Second World War, the entrance is commonly assigned to the original building; see Tricarico 2013, 55 n. 8. Ongoing excavations by the Soprintendenza under direction of Massimo Osanna, which among others concern the western porticus of the Foro Triangolare, may clarify the debate on the chronology of the Foro and its porticoes.

- 15 In the sections of the walls of the Palaestra, Tricarico 2013, pls. III, IV, IX, X, several colors are differentiated and linked with US numbers, but a legend explaining the meaning of these colors is missing; while all four walls include red at the bottom of the visible wall, no chronological conclusions can be drawn from this: the currently visible east wall certainly goes back to a later remodeling. That at least the west wall was completely rebuilt down to the foundation, as argued based on recent excavations in Carafa 2005, can also not be deduced from Tricarico 2013; see, however, Hoffmann 1993, 83–87, who, based on an assessment of the standing walls, argued for a major remodeling of the north, west, and south walls of the Palaestra Sannitica in the Augustan or Tiberian period.

was found out of context, however, and its shape does not allow for safely reconstructing its placement in either portico.¹⁶ In sum, construction of the porticoes of the Foro Triangolare in the Imperial period, which must still be comprehensively substantiated, would seriously challenge the notion of a large athletic-military complex in this quarter. A Late Hellenistic date of the porticoes would make it possible, but by no means prove that the Samnite youths trained here.

2 Palaestra Sannitica (VIII 7, 29)

While there is some debate regarding the function of the Palaestra Sannitica, most scholars agree that this building was used for military-athletic training by the Samnite youths, the *vereiia* (Fig. 2).

Construction of the building is generally dated to the second half of the 2nd century BC, and recently stratigraphic and epigraphic evidence has been cited to substantiate and further refine this date.¹⁷ As argued above, the design of the external walls of this building suggests that it was conceived and possibly built in close connection with the porticoes of the Foro Triangolare.

Three major reasons have been cited to support the identification of the building as a palaestra:

The first reason is the sculptural decoration, which included, in the last phase of use, at least three statues:

- A marble statue of the Doryphoros whose original location cannot be safely reconstructed and whose date is debated in scholarship, ranging from the 2nd century BC to the early Imperial period. With view to the material, marble from Luni, and style, A. Avagliano has recently favored a date in the Tiberian period.¹⁸

- A stone statue that was set up on a well-preserved base, which was combined with a staircase and an altar. This statue, which obviously received special ceremonies and honors (crowning, sacrifice), is not preserved. While the ensemble is made of tufa, it is not original to the building because the staircase is set on top of a drainage channel.

- An honorary statue of Marcus Lucretius Decidianus Rufus, of which only the base was found. While this person lived in the early 1st century AD and seems to have financed major urban remodeling processes and been honored for this, the statue in the Palaestra Sannitica was set up again (*reposit*), probably after damages in AD 62.¹⁹

In sum, none of the known statues can safely be assigned to the original building and serve to determine the (original) function of the building. A Doryphoros statue set up in a later (Tiberian?) period could only be cited as evidence for an athletic use of the original building, assuming that the function of the building did not change, e.g. after 80 BC or in the Augustan period.

The second reason is a famous Oscan dedicatory building inscription that was found in the building in 1797. This inscription is written on a limestone slab (0.41 × 0.76 × 0.035 m) and documents that

Vibius Adiranus, son of Vibius, gave in his will money to the Pompeian *vereiia*; with this money, Vibius Vinicius, son of Maras, Pompeian quaestor, dedicated the construction of this building (presumably the Palaestra Sannitica, note of author) by decision of the senate,

16 Pesando 2002–2003, 239 n. 43; Vetter 1953, 50–51 no. 13; Rix 2002, 104 Po 5; Crawford 2011b, 631–632 Pompei 9. This is a slab framed with cyma reversa moldings on all four sides, 0.59 m long, 0.245 m high, 0.065 m thick, which does not fit well into the architrave or frieze of a portico.

17 Carafa 2005, 25, 31, argues that the Palaestra Sannitica was built before the above-mentioned *tabernae*, which, in turn, were built between 130 and ca. 100 BC; Carafa 2011, 95–98, assigns the Palaestra to the phase of 130–100 BC. A trench excavated in the north portico of the Palaestra Sannitica showed that the northern external wall was built on a battuto that is dated between the 3rd and the first half of the 2nd century BC; Di Maio, Giugliano, and Rispoli 2008. Crawford 2011b, 657, and McDonald 2012, 12, argue that the famous *vereiia* inscription (see below) was orig-

inal to the building and carved only after 123 BC because the formula would reflect Roman legislation of the period of C. Gracchus and later; thus, 123 BC would be a *terminus post quem* for the construction of the Palaestra.

18 Avagliano 2013, 72.

19 CIL X, 851; Pesando 2000, 171. For the statues in detail Avagliano 2013, who convincingly argues that the copy of the Doryphoros could not have been set up on the preserved ensemble of base, staircase, and altar. Cf. also R. Henzel and M. Trümper in this volume. Pesando 2000, 168, suggests that two herms dedicated by Decidianus Rufus may have been set up in the Palaestra Sannitica in the Augustan period. Since these were not found in this building, but in the adjacent Temple of Isis, they will not be taken into account here.




Fig. 2 Pompeii, Palaestra Sannitica, reconstruction of the original plan.

and the same man approved it.²⁰

The precise find spot of this inscription, which was either found inserted into a wall or just placed at the foot of or close to a wall, can no longer safely be determined. Thus, it is debated whether this inscription really belonged to this building, was included in this building in a visible and meaningful way, or whether it was simply stored or reused as convenient building material here. There is also no agreement when this inscription was carved. While the text and dedication as such are always attributed to the 2nd century BC, some argue that the preserved slab is a later copy of the lost Samnite origi-

nal, whereas others identify it as a genuine inscription of the late 2nd century BC.²¹ Ironically, those who favor an early date, challenge the common belief that the inscription refers to the dedication of its very find spot, the Palaestra Sannitica.²² While an early date of the inscription seems to be compatible with the material as well as epigraphic and linguistic criteria, and is, indeed, much more attractive from a cultural and historical point of view, the secondary random reuse of this inscription in this building is an unlikely *lectio difficilior*.²³ The convex rounded moldings at the top edge of the inscribed slab, which M. H. Crawford identified as remains of two

20 *v(ibis) aadirans v(ibeis) eitiuvam paam / vereiiaí púmpaiianaí tristaa- / mentud deded eísak eítiuvad / v(ibis) vífnikiís m(a)r(aheís) kvaísstur púmp- / aians trífbúm ekak kúmben- / nieís tanguinud úpsannam / deded ísídum prúfatted*. Text according to Crawford 2011b, 656–658 Pompei 24; translation McDonald 2012, 3; see also Vetter 1953, 49 no. 11 who lists travertine as material; Rix 2002, 104 Po 3; Avagliano 2013, 74 n. 29.

21 The argument is summarized in McDonald 2012, and Avagliano 2013, 74.

22 Crawford 2011b, 657; McDonald 2012.

23 Expertise and interest of epigraphers versus archaeologists seem to clash here. That the inscription did not necessarily belong to this building and was only reused here as a mere convenient building block or at best as a meaningless decorative feature, as suggested by McDonald 2012, 5–6, seems somewhat far-fetched. This argumentation is based on the assess-

ment of this building in rather general Anglophone literature (Richardson 1988; Laurence 1994; Beard 2008); none of the many recent Italian publications that deal specifically with this building and quarter is referred to.

Avagliano 2007, 154–155 n. 73–74, argues that the material of this inscription, travertine, would be unusual for a 2nd century BC date. Crawford 2011b, 656 lists limestone for this inscription as well as for several other Oscan inscriptions that are safely dated to the 2nd century BC (and whose material Vetter 1953 commonly identifies as travertine); see, e.g., Crawford 2011b, 628–629 Pompei 8; 631 Pompei 9; 634 Pompei 11; 635 Pompei 12; 637 Pompei 13; 644 Pompei 17; 645 Pompei 18; 647 Pompei 19; 648 Pompei 20; there is even a sundial of marble with an Oscan inscription, found in the Stabian Baths and commonly dated to the second half of the 2nd century BC; Crawford 2011b, 650 Pompei 21.

lions' paws, may indicate that the inscription was originally set up in some spectacular, unusual way and with some additional decorative elements above it (such as a lion carved in relief?), but the shallow thickness of the slab (3.5 cm) suggests that it was always attached to a wall or a base.²⁴ Even if the upper decorative part got lost during one of the remodeling phases of the Palaestra, the inscription could still have been prominently displayed in one of the remodeled walls. The east wall of the peristyle courtyard, which definitely goes back completely to a later remodeling, seems a likely location and has been favored by some scholars.²⁵

In sum, it seems most likely that the inscription in its currently preserved form was, from the beginning, carved for and displayed in the Palaestra Sannitica and stayed there in some prominent and visible, albeit if modified setting until AD 79. Thus, it may serve to date the construction of the building and testify to continuous, if again probably modified use and importance of the building from the late 2nd century BC to AD 79. The only reference to a possible function of the building is the mentioning of the *vereiia*, however, that obviously ceased to be important after 80 BC.

The third reason for identifying this building as a palaestra is the plan, which, most recently, was reconstructed with a rectangular peristyle courtyard and just three rooms on its western side: a central exedra with a length corresponding to that of the western colonnade, flanked by two small rooms, whose north-south extension correlates with that of the northern and southern porticoes. Since one of the side rooms presumably served as a secondary entrance, this would have left two rooms of ca. 14 and 28 m² for activities performed in the building.²⁶

In order to support the palaestra-theory, Avagliano recently compared the plan of the Palaestra Sannitica with that of other palaestrae in the eastern Mediter-

anean, notably the so-called Hellenistic Gymnasium in Miletus (2nd century BC), the Palaestra of the Lake in Delos (3rd century BC), and the so-called Gymnasium of the Academy in Athens (probably late Antique period).²⁷ Apart from the fact that all of these buildings are much larger and, above all, have more rooms than the Palaestra Sannitica, the reconstruction and function of the examples in Miletus and Athens have recently been challenged. Arguments cited to deconstruct the palaestra-theory are the long rectangular plans of the peristyle courtyards, the shape and (reduced) number of rooms, and particularly the lack of bathing facilities.²⁸

If the Republican Baths served as a substitute for the lacking bathing facilities, as unanimously argued, both buildings must have been conceived and built together or the Republican Baths must have been older. Both scenarios cannot be proven, as will be shown below. Even if the Republican Baths may, at some point, have been used by those who frequented the Palaestra Sannitica, nothing suggests any exclusive connection between the two buildings. That athletes would have had to cross a major thoroughfare, moving from the Palaestra to the baths, seems like a makeshift solution, at best. Furthermore, the baths probably provided a small colonnaded courtyard for light training, suggesting that they functioned independently and (also) served a clientele that had not trained in the Palaestra Sannitica. Finally, and most crucially, the combination of an independent athletic facility for training youths with a public bath that provided heated relaxing bathing forms is without comparison in the Mediterranean world of 2nd and early 1st century BC. The combination of military-athletic exercise and bathing in warm water was considered taboo and decadent for a long time in the Greek world, because it would have rendered young men effeminate, and it did not become popular before the late 1st century BC or even only 1st century AD.²⁹ This notion and

24 Crawford 2011b, 656–657.

25 Vetter 1953, 49 no. 11; recent assessment of the exterior walls of the Palaestra shows that the east wall was much more heavily restored in modern times than the other three walls and might have housed the inscription when the Palaestra was excavated; Tricarico 2013, pls. III–XI. For the remodeling of the Palaestra, see below.

26 De Waele 2001, 316–317 pls. 40–41; Tricarico 2013, 220–221, fig. XIII, provides only an axonometric reconstruction, but no reconstructed plan. Peristyle courtyard: 17.55 × 32.35 m; northwestern room: 3.16 × 4.74 m; central exedra: 8.95 × 3.16 m. Old plans, e.g. Coarelli 2001, 103 fig. 10 (after Mazois), show a staircase with two flights in the northwestern corner room, but no trace of this survives today, and the most recent state

plan, Tricarico 2013, 213 pl. II, does not show any remains of a staircase.

27 Avagliano 2013, 78 fig. 7.

28 For Miletus, Emme 2013, 59–63; with critical remarks, however, in Trümper 2015, 196–203. For the gymnasium of the Academy, Caruso in this volume; the Palaestra of the Lake in Delos is now even identified as the Gymnasium known from inscriptions of the 3rd century BC (Bruneau et al. 2005, 242 n. 76) but its reconstructed original plan is provided with a *loutron* and at least five rooms on three sides of the peristyle courtyard; Delorme 1960, pl. XV fig. 28.

29 Trümper 2015. The fluted support of a *labrum*, made of Pentelic marble and decorated with an Oscan dedicatory inscription of a *meddix* of the *vereiia*, was found in or close to the Central Baths in Cumae that

strict separation is confirmed by research on *campi* in the western Mediterranean, especially Italy: *campi* mentioned in inscriptions and identified (more or less safely) in the archaeological record were never combined with a Roman-type bath and warm bathing facilities, but only with cold water *piscinae*.³⁰ Therefore, it would be very strange, if the *Palaestra Sannitica*, as a *Palaestra*, and the Republican Baths had ever been linked intentionally and conceptually. At least, such a concept could not be traced back to the influence of Greek-Hellenistic gymnasia or of Roman *campi*, but it would have to be identified as an idiosyncrasy of Samnite Pompeii.

Alternatively, one could hypothesize that the *Palaestra Sannitica* in its original phase included simple washing facilities, such as a *labrum* set up in the courtyard that could be filled with water from a nearby well or cistern, e.g. in the *Foro Triangolare*. A *labrum* was apparently found next to the main entrance when the *Palaestra Sannitica* was excavated.³¹

In sum, the *Palaestra Sannitica* did not conform to standards of safely identified Greek *palaestrae* in the eastern and western Mediterranean, because of its size and plan, but above all because of the possible lack of bathing facilities. Its use as a meeting place of the Samnite *vereiia* and perhaps rather simple and spatially restricted exercise facility still seems most probable, as substantiated by the Oscan dedicatory inscription that was most likely displayed in this building from the very beginning. Accessibility to and thus use of the building could be fully controlled and restricted. The location of entrances clearly suggests, however, that the building was meant to be used in connection with the – more or less contemporaneously built – porticoes of the *Foro Triangolare*.³² While the integration of the *Foro Triangolare* may have compromised the concept of exclusive

controlled use, and the members of the *vereiia* may have had to mix with a larger crowd, it may have provided additional benefits, namely more space for exercise (or strolling), water supply, and cultic facilities.

3 Quadriporticus (VIII 7, 16)

In AD 79, this building included a large peristyle courtyard with rooms on all four sides and was accessible via a staircase from the *Foro Triangolare* and a long corridor and Ionic entrance colonnade from the *Via Stabiana* in the east. Its construction is commonly dated to the 2nd century BC (Pl. 2).

Until recently, the original building was reconstructed as a simple quadriporticus without any rooms, except for an *exedra* in the south, and identified either as a porticus post scaenam for use in relation with the Great Theater or as a gymnasium for use in connection with the *Foro Triangolare* and *Palaestra Sannitica* complex. After the earthquake of AD 62 the building would have been substantially remodeled, adding rooms on all sides for use as gladiatorial barracks.³³

Recent research challenges the common reconstruction of the first building and, with this, the identification of its original function.³⁴ While five building phases have been identified between the period of about 130 BC to AD 79 and the complex was substantially rebuilt in the last three phases (ca. AD 10–79), remains of the first phase walls clearly suggest that the building included rooms on at least three sides from the very beginning: stretches of the back walls of the original complex were identified on all four sides. Even if the width of the porticoes may have been changed over the some 200 years of use,³⁵ the position of the stylobate seems to have been

were probably constructed in the Late Republican period; this support was not found in situ, in its original position, however, and thus its precise use in the baths cannot be safely determined; Volpicella 2006–2007, 213–214 fig. 15; Crawford 2011a, 493–494 Cumae 3; cf. Avagliano – Montalbano in this volume. Crawford dates the inscription to presumably before 180 BC and assumes that the *labrum* had been “placed in a gymnasium, when it was first built at the end of the third century BC, and re-deployed in the reconstruction of the first century AD (see Volpicella), perhaps without the inscription attracting attention.” Volpicella 2006–2007 does not mention a gymnasium, however, and none has so far been identified in Cumae. He argues, instead, that Oscan could have been used long after 180 BC when addressing the general public that was not fully Latinized and may have frequented the baths; he does not make any specific connection between the *vereiia* and the baths.

30 Borlenghi 2011, passim: e.g. Corfinum; Forum Vibii Caburum; Hercula-

neum, *Palaestra* (?); Pompeii, Great *Palaestra*; Saepinum; Trea; Verona? etc. *Piscinae* that can safely be linked with a campus are only attested from the Augustan period onwards.

31 Avagliano 2013, 72: the *labrum* and its base were transported to the Museo Borbonico and obviously can no longer be safely identified (and dated).

32 Otherwise, the builders would hardly have sacrificed one of only three rooms for an entrance.

33 Pesando and Guidobaldi 2006, 63–64; summary of literature Avagliano 2013, 79–80 n. 68–70.

34 Poehler and Ellis 2011; Poehler and Ellis 2012; Poehler and Ellis 2013; Poehler and Ellis 2014.

35 This seems to be the case particularly on the west side; Poehler and Ellis 2011.

maintained in all phases. The distance between the stylobate and the original back walls requires either two-aisled porticoes with an internal row of columns (of which no traces survived anywhere) or porticoes with back rooms. While E. Poehler and S. Ellis reconstructed a double-aisled colonnade in the north, whose northern aisle would have been substituted by a series of rooms in the fifth phase after AD 62, it remains unclear whether this configuration belongs to the original phase of the building or, for example, to a remodeling after 80 BC, when the Odeum was built.³⁶ At least the course of the eastern back wall of the complex is highly irregular, however, and this wall did not run parallel to the stylobate, which rules out the solution of a two-aisled portico.

The original rooms may have been small and low,³⁷ but they still require explanation. Any higher number of such rooms on several sides is not typical of a palaestra/gymnasium or a porticus post scaenam.³⁸ The original entrance situation of the complex, particularly before the construction of the Odeum after 80 BC, cannot be reconstructed and it must remain open whether access could ever be fully controlled, which would be required for a gymnasium.³⁹ The building included a latrine in its two final phases, but no bathing facilities have been identified for any of the phases.

In sum, recent research confirmed that the building belongs to the large urban development program of this quarter after 130 BC. While the final publication of recent research that also includes a hypothetical reconstruction of the original plan⁴⁰ must be awaited for a comprehensive assessment, some preliminary conclusions can be drawn. Use of the original complex as a palaestra seems highly unlikely because of the plan, possibly rather open accessibility, and lacking bathing facilities. Even if this complex may have been used as an ambulatory by visitors of the theater,⁴¹ the presence of

series of rooms suggests additional purposes and functions, for example use for storage, production, and sale of goods, or for dining and accommodation. As a monumental multifunctional complex, located between sanctuaries and entertainment facilities, the Quadriporticus may have drawn crowds all through the day and year for multiple reasons and activities.

4 Domus Publica

The existence of a domus publica in Pompeii is commonly deduced from an Oscan inscription (Vetter 27), which was painted on a pilaster between the houses VIII, 5, 19 and 20 at the Via dell'Abbondanza and whose interpretation is debated. It belongs to the group of *éituns* inscriptions that were found throughout the city and related to the siege by the troops of Cornelius Sulla around 91–89 BC. The inscription Vetter 27 stands out for its formula and mention of a public building (*domus publica*).⁴² Currently, three different interpretations of this inscription and its relevance for an assessment of the archaeological record can be distinguished that are central to the argument of this paper.

I. F. Pesando: The domus publica is identified as a location where military census and levy actions, especially of equestrians, took place and a selected group of soldiers stayed; the (completely preserved) inscription would have served as a signpost, pointing to this building, which would have been located in the lot VIII 6, 5 (Pl. 1). The building of this lot would have been decorated with a unique terracotta frieze, dated to the 3rd century BC and showing an equestrian battle. After the foundation of the Roman colony in 80 BC, the domus publica, whose hypothetical plan is not discussed, would

36 Poehler and Ellis 2012, 11 fig. 19; this double-aisled porticus would have connected the Ionic entrance colonnade in the east and the staircase to the Foro Triangolare in the west. The reconstructed plan, fig. 19, shows series of rooms on all other sides.

37 Poehler and Ellis 2011, 5.

38 For the porticus post scaenam, see Ramallo Asensio 2000.

39 The various thresholds of the eastern entrance corridor from the Via Stabiana to the Quadriporticus and the steps of the Ionic propylon show cuttings for doors or grilles, but it currently cannot be safely determined whether these go back to the first phase or one of the remodeling phases of the building. Since the staircase between the Quadriporticus and the Foro Triangolare has been substantially restored, the question of doors at the foot or top of the staircase can also not be determined.

40 So far, only phase plans, marking the remains assigned to different

phases, have been published, e.g. Poehler and Ellis 2013, 11 fig. 16.

41 As a porticus post scaenam, it would be the earliest currently known example of this building type; Ramallo Asensio 2000, 90–92.

42 Vetter 1953, 56 no. 27; Rix 2002, 106 Po 38; Crawford 2011b, 624–625 Pompei 6. The *éituns* inscriptions commonly include the formula *anter ... íní* (between ... and), and mention the name of a commander at the end. In contrast, Vetter 27 includes words interpreted as *ampt ... ampt* (by ... by), and the name of the commander was either never mentioned (Pesando, Tosti, and Zanella 2010, 150) or is not preserved (Avagliano 2013, 94). Text and translation according to Crawford 2011b, 624–625: *eksuk amvíannud / éituns amp(er)t trībud / tív(tíkad) amp(er)t men-erv[a]s*. The *éituns* from this quarter, by the domus publica, by (the Temple) of Minerva.

have been systematically destroyed and dismantled as an unwelcome symbol of the former Samnite city and its public institutions. The terrain would have been transformed into a garden, which public authorities used as a dump site after the earthquake of AD 62.⁴³ In this reading, the domus publica constituted a central part of the Samnite military-athletic complex that was visually, conceptually and spatially intimately connected with the Republican Baths and the Palaestra Sannitica.⁴⁴

2. A. Avagliano: The *εἰτῦν*s of this and other inscriptions would point to a subdivision of the city into architectural units or quarters shortly before the Sullan occupation and to a subdivision of the Samnite army into units. The *εἰτῦν*s inscriptions would not have served as signposts for armed troops that strayed vagrantly in the city, looking for instructions where to go for the defense of the city, but would have indicated the limits of the urban area to be defended; they would have signaled the militants who were well familiar with the layout of the city to which stretch of the walls they had to go and which commander they were assigned to.⁴⁵ The specific inscription Vetter 27, where reference to the commander would not have been preserved, would not have pointed to a clearly defined area, but to a specific building that must have played a significant role in the defense of the city. Since this public building must have been located next to the Temple of Minerva, this could only have been the Casa di Giuseppe II (VIII 2, 38–39) that was built in the 2nd century BC and occupied a prominent spot for the protection of the southern side of the city (Pl. 1). But the precise design of the house in this period as well as the function of the public building (*domus publica*) are not specified.⁴⁶ According to this interpretation, the Palaestra Sannitica and the Republican Baths still functioned as a conceptual unit, used by the *vereiia* (a public institution of military vocation, similar to the Attic *ephebeia*), whereas the *domus publica* is identified as a separate building for a different group and function.

3. P. Carafa: The inscription is also interpreted as a

reference to an urban area where a military unit was enlisted or that was defended by a single unit, but the sanctuary of Minerva and the *domus/villa publica* are identified as the limits of the area to be defended that therefore could not have been situated close to one another. It is not discussed in more detail, where the *domus publica* would have been located, whether it could be identified at all, and what its precise function would have been.⁴⁷ This reading does not require any connection between the Palaestra Sannitica, the Republican Baths, and the *domus publica*.

Focusing on the identification and significance of the *domus publica*, all three interpretations entail problems. The last reading seems least problematic, but the difference in the formula between the inscription Vetter 27 and the other *εἰτῦν*s inscriptions is simply ignored.⁴⁸

Recent research challenges the second reading, because the Casa di Giuseppe II was built over a square building from around 300 BC, supposedly with an impressive Tuscan atrium and with all of its three stories at the end of the 2nd century BC.⁴⁹ This design of a luxurious three-story house is hard to reconcile with the idea of a *domus publica* shortly before 89 BC and the defense of a city wall, which must already have been overbuilt at this point. Avagliano also does not discuss when, why, and how the Casa di Giuseppe II would have been transformed into a private house.

The first and most intriguing and holistic interpretation depends crucially upon the identification of lot VIII 6, 5, which has already been convincingly refuted by Avagliano. She argues that the lot was most likely occupied by two houses from the 2nd century BC to 62 AD when the terrain was transformed into a garden after irreparable earthquake damage.⁵⁰ There is no conclusive evidence that the terracotta frieze with the equestrian battle scene was ever found and displayed in the lot VIII 6, 5,⁵¹ and according to R. Känel, its date must be significantly lowered from the 3rd century BC⁵² to

43 Pesando 1997; Pesando 2000; Pesando 2002–2003, 239–243; Pesando, Tosti, and Zanella 2010, 149–154, esp. 151.

44 Some scholars even identified the *vereiia pompeiana* as Samnite cavalry or *equites campani*; consequently, the same group would have frequented the Palaestra Sannitica and the *domus publica*; Avagliano 2013, 94, n. 129.

45 Avagliano 2013, 82–94, esp. 91, based on previous interpretations by A. Prosdocimi and R. Antonini.

46 Avagliano 2013, 94.

47 Carafa 2011, 98.

48 While this is a philological discourse, which cannot be discussed in detail here, recent special publications commonly take the difference in formulas as meaningful; e.g. Crawford 2011b, 624–625 Pompei 6; also Avagliano 2013, 84.

49 Carafa 2005, 19.

50 Avagliano 2013, 85–88, who critically assesses the results of recent excavations in this lot, published by Pesando, Tosti, and Zanella 2010.

51 Avagliano 2013, 87 n. 103.

52 Date proposed by D'Agostino 1982, and followed by Pesando 1997.

ca. 100 BC.⁵³ Since one fragment was found in recent excavations under a pavement in the atrium of the Casa di Giuseppe II⁵⁴ and other fragments were found to the south of this house, the frieze may originally have decorated this house, maybe the walls of its Tuscan atrium. Since friezes with similar topics have been found in other private houses,⁵⁵ this may have been a fitting decoration for an ambitious private house with layout on three terraced stories, even if the frieze currently has no exact parallels in Pompeii.

In sum, there is currently no conclusive evidence for safely reconstructing the location, layout, and function of the public building mentioned in the *ēituns* inscription Vetter 27. Even if it seems most likely that the *ēituns* inscriptions referred to a clearly defined urban area and military unit, it has yet to be determined what the *ēituns* of Vetter 27 would have done by a public building by the Temple of Minerva. The archaeological evidence of VIII 6, 5 and the Casa di Giuseppe II yields no convincing proof for an identification as *domus publica*. Finally, and most importantly here, the notion of a conceptual and spatial connection between the Palaestra Sannitica, the Republican Baths, and the *domus publica* rests on highly tenuous grounds and should be viewed with great caution, if not best be abandoned.

5 Republican Baths (VIII 5, 36)

The Republican Baths play a key role in the minimalist as well as maximalist readings of the Foro Triangolare complex (Pl. 3).

While the building was correctly identified by its excavator A. Maiuri as a Roman-style bath building with separate sections for men and women, he vaguely dated construction to 100 to 70 BC. Maiuri recognized that the baths were deliberately razed and that the lot was transformed into a peristyle garden for the adjacent Casa della

Calce (VIII 5, 28). He dated this transformation to the Augustan period and argued that the baths must have been built and managed by the very owners of the Casa della Calce who had conceived them as a profitable investment in a period of urban need.⁵⁶

Pesando argued for a construction date in the 2nd century BC, which would make a clear connection of the baths with other Samnite buildings in the Foro Triangolare complex possible. He also proposed the most rigorous reading, assigning exclusive use of the baths to the Samnite male and female youths, and voting for public initiative and ownership; after 80 BC no more investments would have been made in this political-social symbol of Samnite identity, until the baths were finally abandoned in the late 1st century BC. A hoard including 90 coins that was found in a settling basin of the drain in the sidewalk just to the east of the men's apodyterium (Pl. 3 room 2, basin q4) would confirm rapid decline of the baths after 80 BC. This hoard contained Ebusan, Pseudo-Ebusan, and Pseudo-Massaliot, Roman Republican, and Greek coins that were circulating in Pompeii in the early 80s BC.⁵⁷ Following Pesando's intriguing interpretation, the baths were unanimously identified as a substitute for missing bathing facilities in the Palaestra Sannitica, by both minimalists and maximalists.⁵⁸

The above-mentioned new research project (Topoi C-6-8) aims at comprehensively reassessing the development, function, and urban significance and context of this building.⁵⁹ Construction of the baths in the 2nd century BC could be confirmed by stratigraphic finds, but a more precise date in the 2nd century that would allow for assessing the potential role of this building in the urban development of the Foro Triangolare complex currently cannot be provided. While stratigraphy did not yet yield a precise date for the structural and functional transformation of this lot, an abandonment of the baths in the second half of the 1st century BC seems most likely.⁶⁰ Pesando's ideas regarding development, func-

53 Oral reference; R. Känel proposes a highly intriguing interpretation: the frieze could have been related to the campaigns of Marius, and would have been deliberately destroyed and spread by the Sullan fraction. I am very much indebted to R. Känel for discussion of this frieze and generous sharing of his expertise and ideas.

54 Pesando 1997, 59 n. 38; Avagliano 2013, 87 n. 103.

55 Esp. in Fregellae: Coarelli 1994; Känel 2010, 267.

56 Maiuri 1950, esp. 130.

57 Most importantly Pesando 2002–2003, but see also Pesando 1997; Pesando 2000; Pesando, Tosti, and Zanella 2010.

58 He was not the first, however, to link the baths to the Foro Triangolare

complex; see a summary of earlier research in De Waele 2001, 331–332.

59 See remarks before n. 1. Final evaluation of this project is under way and will be published in a monograph. This is not the place to discuss results in due detail, outlining all of the evidence and arguments.

60 After preliminary reading of the pottery, finds made under the pavements of the house structures can only be vaguely dated to the 1st century BC or at best to the second half of the 1st century BC; the strongest indicator for a more precise date is the stucco decoration of a room that the owner of the Casa della Calce installed in his newly enlarged house, over the former vicolo between the house and the baths (Fig. 5, to the



Fig. 3 Pompeii, Republican Baths, praefurnium with evidence of remodeling.

tion, and ownership must be revised, however.

Development: During its period of use, key features of the building were significantly remodeled, among them certainly the heating technology and water management and possibly also the bathing program. While stratigraphy does not allow for safely dating these changes to before or after 80 BC, they nonetheless testify to continuous maintenance and improvements. Identifiable remodeling measures include the following:

- The laconicum of the men's section (Pl. 3 room 6) was probably built or at least significantly remodeled in a later period. This may have entailed secondary construction or remodeling of a small (colonnaded?) courtyard to the south of the laconicum (Pl. 3 room 16) that was accessible from the men's bathing section and may have served for relaxing sojourns or light exercise. In a final phase, dated by stratigraphy to around 50 BC, the laconicum was fortified with buttresses along its eastern side. The laconicum was a highly fashionable bathing form in the 2nd/1st century BC in the entire Mediterranean, commonly conceived for use by men. Such a Greek-connoted sweat bath was added in the Stabian Baths in a second phase, at the initiative of two duoviri

of the young Roman colony shortly after 80 BC.⁶¹ Consequently, the bathing program of the Republican Baths was trendy, either already in the original design⁶² or as a result of a modernizing renovation (before or after 80 BC).

- The heating system, which was highly innovative, if experimental in the original design, was changed and improved several times. Among others, the original number of six fires under six arched openings was reduced and the firing chambers were rendered more efficient (Fig. 3).
- The water management was at least once significantly remodeled and improved. The baths incorporated a preexisting deep well that was made of large Sarno limestone blocks and used as an open well from which water was drawn by hand (Pl. 3 room 14; Figs. 4–5). When the well was first used in the baths, some changes were made, using opus incertum walls with lava. While the design and functioning of the well in this phase can no longer be reconstructed, it was most likely connected with a reservoir over the vaulted room to its north (Pl. 3 room 13a/b).⁶³ In a later phase during the period of

northwest of room 9); while little remains of this stucco today, it is commonly assigned to the Second Style.

⁶¹ CIL X 829.

⁶² In this case, the Republican Baths could even have served as a model for

the remodeling of the Stabian Baths after 80 BC.

⁶³ Water was most likely already lifted with some sophisticated mechanism such as a tread wheel/bucket chain system, but no traces of this survive.

the baths, the well was significantly modified: enlarged in the east and vaulted in its 'old' western part (Figs. 4–5). This served to install a more sophisticated water-lifting device, with a bucket chain in the new open eastern part and some lifting mechanism on top of the vaulted part. Presumably, the reservoir over room 13 was also changed. While the north and south walls of the 'old' western part of the well are heavily encrusted with thick layers of calcareous concretions (Figs. 4–5), the new eastern part lacks any traces of similar concretions. Maiuri concluded from this phenomenon that the well was remodeled only shortly before the abandonment of the baths and never used in its refined form.⁶⁴ Such a costly late renovation would clearly challenge Pesando's notion of a decline after 80 BC, but the development and chronology of the water supply system is not yet fully known and awaits final assessment.

- Several features were redecorated or repaired: for example, the supports of the labra in both caldaria were fortified and redecorated; the opus signinum revetment in the men's immersion pool was renewed at least once; the stucco decoration of the women's tepidarium was embellished, using a yellow socle with polychrome dots imitating marble – this decoration is now commonly assigned to the (late) First Style (Fig. 6).
- The walls of the domestic peristyle garden were set onto the quasi-cleaned pavements of the bathing rooms. This suggests that the baths had not been abandoned for a longer period and used as a dump, but that the transformation between baths and house occurred swiftly and immediately after the abandonment of baths (Fig. 7).

- The coin hoard cannot safely determine the end of the use period of the baths: the settling basin, in which it was found, was obviously deep enough so that the hoard did not get flushed away; the hoard may have somewhat hindered the settling process, but it did not necessarily block the entire drain.⁶⁵
- While the reasons for the abandonment of the baths cannot be safely determined, the archaeological record and urban context provide some clues. The baths were certainly never connected to the public aqueduct which became standard for all publicly accessible baths in the early Imperial period.⁶⁶ The heating technology and water management of the Republican Baths may have been innovative at the time of construction, but were most likely less advanced and sophisticated than those in the original Stabian Baths, built at the end of the 2nd century BC. In the late 1st century BC, the technology of the Republican Baths was surely outdated and comprehensive modernization in order to meet contemporary standards would certainly have been very costly. Therefore, dwindling profitability of the Republican Baths may have caused their abandonment. In contrast, a kind of political-social stigmatization of the baths after 80 BC, as suggested by Pesando, is difficult to accept: the Palaestra Sannitica, which was presumably much more strongly imbued with Samnite political-military ideology than a standard bathing facility such as the Republican Baths, was significantly remodeled and embellished in the Augustan period, when the Samnite vereia certainly had no longer any function and social significance.

Function: As argued above, exclusive use of the baths by specific groups cannot be derived from the archaeological record, namely from criteria such as design,

⁶⁴ Maiuri 1950, 128–129. – The water management of the Republican Baths is currently being investigated by Thomas Heide.

⁶⁵ Maiuri 1950, 126, does not describe the drainage system in detail, but his field director A. D'Avino provides more detailed information in his unpublished excavation report, 1950, 173: measures of the settling basin: 0.65 × 0.65 m, 0.9 m deep; the settling basin was found in a depth of 0.1–0.15 m below the walking level and was entirely reveted with opus signinum; the drain (0.3 m wide, 0.3 m high) was covered with Sarno limestone slabs; both the drain and the settling basin were partially filled with sediments, which would testify to long use of the drainage system, but did not obstruct it; the coins were found in the sediment layer of the settling basin. Today, the sidewalk is covered with modern cement so

that the drain and settling basins can no longer be studied.

⁶⁶ Baths built in the late 2nd or early 1st century BC, such as the Stabian Baths and the Forum Baths, were later connected to the aqueduct; baths newly built from the early Imperial period onwards were supplied by the aqueduct from the beginning, among them the Suburban Baths, the Sarno Baths, the Palaestra Baths, the Baths in the Praedia of Julia Felix, and the Central Baths. For the abandonment of the baths and the reuse of lot VIII 5, 36, see now: Monika Trümper, "Baths to House: Transformation of the Republican Baths in Pompeii." In *Umgebaut. Umbau-, Umnutzungs- und Umwertungsprozesse in der antiken Architektur*. Ed. by K. Piesker. Diskussionen zur Archäologischen Bauforschung 13. Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner, 2018. Forthcoming.




Fig. 4 Pompeii, Republican Baths, deep well.



Fig. 5 Pompeii, Republican Baths, deep well.



Fig. 6 Pompeii, Republican Baths, women's tepidarium, renewed stucco decoration.



Fig. 7 Pompeii, Republican Baths, men's tepidarium, walls of house set on clean pavements of baths.

accessibility and urban-spatial context. The design and bathing program of the baths can be identified as standard for publicly accessible baths of the late Republican period in the entire western Mediterranean, and the baths are not at all typical of bathing facilities in any safely identified contemporary athletic complexes in the eastern and western Mediterranean. The location of the Republican Baths was certainly carefully chosen with view to maximum profit. Situated at a major crossing of a quarter that was significantly developed in the second half of the 2nd century BC, the Republican Baths were

visible, conveniently accessible, and thus would easily have attracted clients.

If the coin hoard mentioned above can be identified as a purse that a customer of the baths accidentally dropped when changing in the men's apodyterium it may suggest that visitors had to pay for entry to the baths.⁶⁷ This is a common practice in publicly accessible baths, but seems somewhat unnecessary and strange for supposed exclusive use of the facility by a privileged group such as the Samnite youths.

⁶⁷ Admittedly, this scenario, proposed by Maiuri 1950, 127, and Stannard 2005, 122, is somewhat strange: the drain in the apodyterium that evacuates into the settling basin where the hoard was found is a wide, very shallow open channel, like a slight depression in the pavement; this chan-

nel was certainly not flushed continuously, but only temporarily, when the immersion pool in the men's caldarium was emptied or bathers splashed lots of water out of the labrum.

Ownership: Without conclusive inscriptions, it is difficult to safely determine the ownership of baths. In general, the 2nd and 1st centuries BC were a period of transition, when baths built by public initiative and managed by public authorities became more common. Before this period, publicly accessible baths were usually built and managed by private persons as business investments.⁶⁸ The continuous existence of privately owned and publicly accessible baths in the Roman Imperial period is well attested for Pompeii and beyond.⁶⁹

The Republican Baths provide few clues for determining their ownership. While the deep well may have been built at public initiative and expense some time before the 2nd century BC,⁷⁰ the surrounding structures that predate the baths do not speak for any coherent building program or public use. These include several hydraulic installations, spread over the entire lot,⁷¹ and features that suggest industrial use. A similar situation was recently identified in the nearby lot I 1, 1–2 on the eastern side of the Via Stabiana: a large well, made of Sarno limestone blocks, dated to the 2nd century BC and interpreted as a public well was surrounded by or even incorporated into structures used for industrial activity.⁷²

The central question is whether and when the wells identified as public enterprises could be incorporated and continuously used in private buildings, or, to put it more bluntly, whether the ‘public well’ of the Republican Baths necessarily provides safe evidence for pub-

lic ownership of the baths. The well in lot I 1, 1–2 was presumably continuously accessible as a public well immediately next to private workshops and was only privatized and included into retail space in the early 1st century AD.⁷³ The deep well in IX 2, 1–29 seems to have been used as a publicly accessible well at least until AD 62, and was even embellished with an arched superstructure.⁷⁴ The deep well of the Stabian Baths was only built together with and specifically for the baths in the late 2nd century BC.⁷⁵ One of the largest deep wells with a sophisticated water-lifting device was incorporated into the Casa della Regina d’Inghilterra (VII 14, 5), but it is unclear when exactly this happened, whether the well was ever used within the context of the house and for how long. The massive walls of this well were never dismantled, razed, or modified, as in the case of many other public deep wells, but instead left standing at a significant height above the floor level of surrounding rooms; this suggests that the well was used, at least for some time, for the purpose of the house and its various industrial facilities.⁷⁶ Generally, the integration of large rectangular deep wells in buildings of the 2nd and 1st centuries BC (before the aqueduct was built) seems to point to public initiative, but the topic certainly deserves closer investigation which cannot be provided here.

The transformation of private into public space is well attested in Pompeii in various periods: for example, houses and tabernae under the eastern side of the Forum were replaced by public buildings in the Augustan

68 This is at least suggested by the few available textual sources (literary texts and papyri); Fagan 1999; Trümper 2013.

69 In Pompeii: Baths in the Praedia of Julia Felix (rented out as *balneum venerium et nongentum*, CIL IV, 1136), Baths of Crassus Frugi (CIL X, 1063) and most likely also the Sarno Baths and the Palaestra Baths. For the phenomenon in general, see Fagan 1999.

70 Schmolder-Veit 2009, 117 fig. 12, differentiates between private and public deep wells: the public examples were larger (ca. 2 × 2 m) and mostly rectangular, whereas the private ones were always round and smaller, with diameters of one meter or less.

The date of the deep well in the Republican Baths cannot be securely determined archaeologically. This holds true for most deep wells in Pompeii, see Schmolder-Veit 2009, 116 n. 22; for recent lists of deep wells in public and private contexts (both incomplete though) see Schmolder-Veit 2009, 118–119; Dessales 2013, 217. Recently excavated deep wells include: a) IX 2.1.29, 1.98 × 1.98 m, which was made of Sarno limestone blocks, but could not be safely dated; Pender 2008; b) I.1.1–10, 1.54 × 1.08 m, which was also made of Sarno limestone blocks (with grooves from ropes on the upper face) and dated to the 2nd century BC; Ellis et al. 2011, 3–4. I owe these references to Domenico Esposito.

71 A channel in rooms 26, 27, 28 (Fig. 5), running from west to east; a basin in the laconicum that was cut by a well (Fig. 5 room 30); a small bell-shaped cistern and adjacent well under the pavement of the men’s apody-

terium (Fig. 5 room 25).

72 Ellis et al. 2011, 3–5.

73 Ellis et al. 2011, 5.

74 Pender 2008.

75 The Stabian Baths were also reinvestigated within the frame of the Topoi C-6-8 project, and their construction date could be significantly revised: they were not built in the 5th century BC and did not include an Archaic deep well, as proposed in the influential monograph by Eschbach 1979, but were only built together with the well in the late 2nd c century BC; for preliminary results, see Trümper 2017.

Size, location, development, and above all two inscriptions suggest that the Stabian Baths were built at public initiative in the late 2nd century BC and remained public property until AD 79: 1) Oscan dedicatory inscription by the quaestor Mr. Atinius on a sundial that was found in the Stabian Baths and is commonly dated to the second half of the 2nd century BC; Vetter 1953, 50 no. 12; Rix 2002, 104 Po 4; Crawford 2011b, 650–651 Pompei 21; 2) Latin dedicatory inscription by two duoviri of the Roman colony who initiated construction of a laconicum and dextricarium as well as repair of the palaestra and porticus, commonly dated to shortly after 80 BC; CIL X, 829.

76 Schmolder-Veit 2009, 118–119 no. 15; other wells, such as no. 19, obviously went out of use when they were included in private tabernae.

period at the latest; a house next to the (publicly owned) Stabian Baths was razed and its terrain was included in the baths sometime between AD 41 and 79;⁷⁷ the (most likely publicly owned) Central Baths were built over demolished houses after AD 62. In contrast, transformation of public buildings into private space is more difficult to imagine, particularly during a heyday of urban development, as is commonly reconstructed for the Augustan period. This is again a phenomenon, which requires more comprehensive assessment, particularly for the Augustan period.

The Republican Baths were, probably from the beginning, closely interlocked with the western adjacent Casa delle Pareti Rosse (VIII 5, 37). While the original western limit of the Republican Baths currently cannot be securely reconstructed, it possibly did not run straight, but deviated twice, serving at least partially as a partition wall between the house and the baths. This phenomenon can also be observed for the original Stabian Baths, whose layout had to respect a more or less contemporaneously built rectangular house in the southwest corner of the lot; in this case, however, the baths and the house were subdivided by a double wall that clearly marked private vs. public property (Pl. 4).

No evidence of a similar duplication of boundary walls was found in the Republican Baths.

After outlining the available criteria, it must remain open which one is really conclusive for determining public vs. private ownership, the inclusion of a presumably public deep well in the 2nd century BC (public ownership?), the transformation into a private house in the late 1st century BC (private ownership?), or the lack of a clear double boundary wall (private ownership?). Even if publicly owned, however, nothing indicates exclusive use and function, and the existence of a separate section for women most strongly speaks for use by a broad, paying clientele.

In sum, the Republican Baths were built with innovative features and technology in the 2nd century BC, then remodeled and partially modernized before they

were abandoned in the second half of the 1st century BC, presumably when they were no longer fashionable or profitable. While the location of the Republican Baths at a major crossing and in a quarter that saw significant urban development in 2nd century BC was certainly chosen carefully with view to attracting visitors,⁷⁸ no intimate conceptual and spatial connection with any other buildings in the area can safely be identified. In contrast to the Republican Baths, two other publicly accessible baths that were most likely publicly owned and certainly built before the Augustan period, were both continuously used and modernized at public expense until AD 79.⁷⁹ Therefore, the integration of a presumably public well notwithstanding, the Republican Baths are best understood as a private initiative and business investment.

6 Conclusion

The socio-political structure of Late Hellenistic Samnite Pompeii is largely unknown, and it must remain open who would have embraced either the Greek gymnasium or the Roman campus as an institution and building type, and why. While the Greek gymnasium and palaestra as building types were developed in the 4th century BC, the campus is mentioned in Late Republican inscriptions from Latin colonies in Italy, whereas a clearly recognizable building type with porticoes and piscina seems to have developed only from the Augustan period onwards.⁸⁰

It must be emphasized that, despite rich epigraphic evidence, Pompeii's inscriptions do not include any reference to a gymnasium or campus and related offices, institutions, and groups (such as the gymnasiarchy, *ephebeia*). The term *iuvenis* was used in Pompeian election notices to refer to a young man, but a *collegium iuventutis* is not mentioned in any inscription and the interpretation of a graffito by Geganus Romulus, *aedilis iuvenalium* is debated.⁸¹ A palaestra and porticus were

⁷⁷ Trümper 2017.

⁷⁸ The existence of a deep well that could serve as major water supply of the baths was certainly an added bonus.

⁷⁹ The Stabian Baths, Trümper 2017; and the barely studied Forum Baths, which were certainly constructed after 80 BC by two *duoviri* of the early colony, as recorded by two identical inscriptions; see CIL X, 819 and Fagan 1999, 250–251 no. 62; another inscription on the labrum in the

men's caldarium records that two *duoviri* let this labrum made with public money, in the year AD 3 or 4; CIL X, 817; Fagan 1999, 252 no. 68.

⁸⁰ Delorme 1960; Borlenghi 2011.

⁸¹ A. E. Cooley and M. G. L. Cooley 2004, 114, with reference to CIL IV, 3741; Borlenghi 2011, 225; that the graffito CIL IV, 8521, refers to *ludi iuvenalis*, Geganus Romulus acting as a *curator lusus iuvenum*, is not unanimously accepted.

repaired in the Stabian Baths shortly after 80 BC, as mentioned in a Latin dedicatory inscription of two *duoviri*, suggesting that these elements belonged to the original Samnite building of the late 2nd century BC (Pl. 4).⁸² It is unclear though whether *palaestra* referred only to the open courtyard, whereas *porticus* designated the colonnades surrounding the courtyard in the south, east, and most likely also north; or whether *palaestra* referred to the courtyard with surrounding porticoes, as is common for Greek gymnasia, while *porticus* designated some other unknown feature. In the first case, the comprehensive meaning of the word *palaestra* may not have been sufficiently known to the Roman *duoviri*. Since the *duoviri* also dedicated a *laconicum* and *destricarium*, which in terminology and function were clear allusions to Greek culture, the term *palaestra* may have served the same purpose, its exact shape and function notwithstanding. There is no indication, however, that the ‘*palaestra*’ of the Stabian Baths was ever used for athletic-military training by specific groups, before or after 80 BC.

Analysis of the archaeological record does not yield a clearer picture. The number of safely identified, sufficiently known purpose-built gymnasia (*palaestrae*) and *campi* in the Hellenistic west, which could be referred to for comparison, is very low. Examples include the Gymnasium (or rather *palaestra*) in Solunto (2nd century BC, located in the center of the city)⁸³ and *Campi* in Alba Fucens, Corfinium, Herdonia, and Pompeii (Great *Palaestra*) that were built in the early Imperial period, however, and located variously inside or outside the city. The complex of the Foro Triangolare in its minimum or maximum reading differs significantly from any of these. If the individual elements assigned to this complex are evaluated with view to their potential use for athletic-military training and related activities, using a scale of 1 (no) to 4 (yes), the following picture emerges (Pl. 1):⁸⁴

1: Quadriporticus, Republican Baths, lot VIII 6, 5 and Casa di Giuseppe II as *domus publica*

2: Foro Triangolare with portico(es) and open-air

race-track, if built in the 2nd century BC

3: *Palaestra Sannitica*, particularly (or solely?) if connected with porticoes/race-track of the Foro Triangolare

According to this scheme, only the Great *Palaestra* would be rated 4, securely (if not solely) used as a sports facility in the Roman colony, but not before the Augustan period.

Construction of the Great Theater, Quadriporticus, *Palaestra Sannitica*, Republican Baths and possibly also the porticoes of Foro Triangolare in the second half of the 2nd century clearly testifies to the existence of some urban development program and the importance of this area. An embellishing remodeling occurred in the Augustan period, including again the Great Theater, the Quadriporticus, the *Palaestra Sannitica*, and the Foro Triangolare that was decorated with honorary monuments and furniture, but – and this is crucial – excluding the Republican Baths that were even destroyed. While it is commonly assumed, that the athletic-military function of the Foro Triangolare complex declined or ceased in the Augustan period one wonders why it would have been renovated and what it would have been used for in this period.

This regards, first and foremost, the *Palaestra Sannitica*, which would not only have lost its bathing facility, but also gained serious competition from the newly built Great *Palaestra*. While the building was newly decorated with statues (*herms*, *Doryphoros*?), it also lost a substantial part of its peristyle courtyard to the adjacent Iseum at some point during its history.⁸⁵ Pesando argued that a certain Marcus Lucretius Decidianus Rufus, the second most important man in Augustan Pompeii, would have initiated a comprehensive renovation program in the Foro Triangolare area that included setting up a series of *herms* found in various locations⁸⁶ and the dedication of something by decree of the *decurions*, which could possibly be recognized as renovation of the *Palaestra Sannitica*.⁸⁷ In recognition of his generosity, M. Lucretius Decidianus Rufus would have received an honorary statue in the *Palaestra Sannitica*, which would have

⁸² CIL X, 829.

⁸³ For gymnasia in Sicily, see Trümper in this volume.

⁸⁴ 1 = not likely at all to have served for athletic-military training and related activities; 2 = possibly served for athletic-military training and related activities; 3 = likely served for athletic-military training and related activities; 4 = certainly served for athletic-military and related activities.

⁸⁵ The development of the Sanctuary of Isis is debated, which cannot be

discussed in detail here; see the recent overview in Gasparini 2011 with earlier bibliography.

⁸⁶ Pesando 2000, 164 fig. 5: Foro Triangolare, Odeum, cemetery of Porta Stabia, and two in the sacrarium of the Iseum, which had most likely originally been set up in the *Palaestra Sannitica* and were reused after AD 62 in the Iseum.


⁸⁷ CIL X, 952.

been set up again (reposit) in this building by a relative after the earthquake in AD 62.⁸⁸ According to this intriguing narrative, the Palaestra Sannitica would have served as a kind of memorial of the good old Samnite days (and institutions such as the *vereiia*) that was nostalgically kept in the Augustan period, when Pompeii otherwise was comprehensively modernized after the model of Augustan Rome, and even after AD 62, when Samnite days were long past. Athletic-military training can hardly have played any role here anymore, however, and it remains completely open who would have frequented this building for which purposes and activities.


The inhabitants of Late Hellenistic Samnite Pompeii adopted many building types known in the western Mediterranean at this time, among them the theater (Great Theater), the temple with porticoes (Temple of Apollo. Temple of Venus), the multifunctional porticus-complex (Quadriporticus), the basilica, the publicly accessible bath (Stabian Baths, Republican Baths), the

atrium house, and the atrium peristyle house. However, a clearly recognizable standard Greek palaestra or gymnasium or a Roman campus were not among them. The Palaestra Sannitica as a sports facility, used with or without the Foro Triangolare, was a modest substandard solution in comparison to Greek palaestrae and Roman campi; because of lacking parallels, it cannot be identified as a typical Samnite concept, however. In contrast, the Republican Baths were, like the nearby Stabian Baths, a highly fashionable, fully functioning publicly accessible bath complex that is hard to see in a conceptual unit with the Palaestra Sannitica. If the size of the original Palaestra Sannitica is compared with that of the contemporary Quadriporticus and the palaestra of the original Stabian Baths, let alone with that of the later Great Palaestra (Pl. 5), it is obvious that the activities of the Samnite *vereiia*, from a spatial point of view, did not play such a significant role in Late Hellenistic Pompeii.

88 CIL X, 851; the original Augustan dedication is not known.




Pl. 1 1 Pompeii, Area of the Foro Triangolare; buildings identified as part of the athletic-military complex. 1 Foro Triangolare (porticoes, race-track?); 2 Palaestra Sannitica; 3 Quadruporticus; 4 Lor VIII 6, 5 (domus publica?); 6 Republican Baths.




Pl. 2 Pompeii, Quadrifortis, phase plan.



Pl. 3 Pompeii, Republican Baths, reconstructed plan.



Pl. 4 Pompeii, Stabian Baths, reconstructed plan of the original building.



Pl. 5 Pompeii, Palaestra Sannitica, Stabian Baths, Great Palaestra: scale to scale comparison.

Bibliography

Avagliano 2007

Alessandra Avagliano. "La Palestra Sannitica di Pompei". In *Il 'Doriforo' di Policletto*. Ed. by V. Franciosi. Naples: Jovene, 2007, 127–174.

Avagliano 2013

Alessandra Avagliano. "Il ginnasio di Vibio Adirano e a vereia. Con una nota sulla domus publica di Pompei". In *Pompei/Messene: il Doriforo e il suo contesto*. Ed. by V. Franciosi and P. Thémelis. Naples: Università degli Studi Suor Orsola Benincasa, 2013, 67–123.

Avagliano 2016

Alessandra Avagliano. "Looking for Herakles at the Slopes of the Vesuvius". *BABESCH Annual Papers on Mediterranean Archaeology* 91 (2016), 161–172.

Avagliano 2017

Alessandra Avagliano. "Eracle a Pompei? La documentazione archeologica dal santuario del Foro Triangolare". *Rendiconti dell'Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 28 (2017), 165–207.

Beard 2008

Mary Beard. *Pompeii. The Life of a Roman Town*. London: Profile Books, 2008.

Borlenghi 2011

Aldo Borlenghi. *Il campus. Organizzazione e funzione di uno spazio pubblico in età romana. Le testimonianze in Italia e nelle province occidentali*. Thiasos. Rivista di archeologia e storia dell'architettura antica 1. Rome: Quasar, 2011.

Bruneau et al. 2005

Philippe Bruneau, Jean Ducat, Michèle Brunet, Alexandre Farnoux, and Jean-Charles Moretti, eds. *Guide de Délos, 4th ed. Updated by Brunet, Michèle and Farnoux, Alexandre and Moretti, Jean-Charles*. Athens: École française d'Athènes, 2005.

Carafa 2005

Paolo Carafa. "Pubblicando la Casa di Giuseppe II (VII 2, 38–39) e il Foro Triangolare". In *Nuove ricerche archeologiche a Pompei ed Ercolano*. Ed. by P. G. Guzzo and M. P. Guidobaldi. Atti del convegno internazionale, Roma 28–30 novembre 2002. Studi della Soprintendenza archeologica di Pompei 10. Naples: Electa, 2005, 19–35.

Carafa 2011

Paolo Carafa. "Minervae et Marti et Herculi aedes doricae fient (Vitr. 1.2.5). The Monumental History of the Sanctuary in Pompeii's So-Called Triangular Forum". In *The Making of Pompeii. Studies in the History and Urban Development of an Ancient Town*. Ed. by S. J. R. Ellis. Journal of Roman Archaeology Suppl. 85. Portsmouth: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 2011, 89–111.

Carandini, Carafa, and D'Alessio 2001

Andrea Carandini, Paolo Carafa, and Maria T. D'Alessio. "Nuovi progetti, nuove domande, nuovi metodi". In *Pompei. Scienza e Società. 250° Anniversario degli Scavi di Pompei, (Atti Convegno Napoli 1998)*. Ed. by P. G. Guzzo. Milano and Naples: Electa, 2001, 127–129.

Coarelli 1994

Filippo Coarelli. "Due fregi da Fregellae: un documento storico della prima guerra Siriaca?" *Ostraka* 3 (1994), 93–108.

Coarelli 2001

Filippo Coarelli. "Il Foro Triangolare: decorazione e funzione". In *Pompei. Scienza e Società. 250° Anniversario degli Scavi di Pompei, (Atti Convegno Napoli 1998)*. Ed. by P. G. Guzzo. Milano and Naples: Electa, 2001, 97–107.

Coarelli 2002

Filippo Coarelli. *Pompeii*. Munich: Hirmer, 2002.

A. E. Cooley and M. G. L. Cooley 2004

Alison E. Cooley and M. G. L. Cooley. *Pompeii. A Sourcebook*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.

Crawford 2011a

Michael H. Crawford, ed. *Imagines Italicae. A Corpus of Italic Inscriptions Vol. 1*. London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, 2011.

Crawford 2011b

Michael H. Crawford, ed. *Imagines Italicae. A Corpus of Italic Inscriptions Vol. 2*. London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, 2011.

D'Agostino 1982

Bruno D'Agostino. "Uno scavo in Museo. Il fregio fittile di Pompei". *Annali di archeologia e storia antica* 4 (1982), 63–93.

De Waele 2001

Jozef Arthur De Waele. *Il tempio dorico del foro triangolare di Pompei*. Studi della Soprintendenza archeologica di Pompei 2. Naples: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2001.

Delorme 1960

Jean Delorme. *Gymnasion. Étude sur les monuments consacrés à l'éducation en Grèce (des origines à l'empire Romain)*. Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 196. Paris: De Boccard, 1960.

Dessales 2013

Hélène Dessales. *Le partage de l'eau. Fontaines et distribution hydraulique dans l'habitat urbain de l'Italie romaine*. Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 351. Rome: École française de Rome, 2013.

Di Maio, Giugliano, and Rispoli 2008

Giovanni Di Maio, Immacolata Giugliano, and Paola Rispoli. "Pompei via del Tempio di Iside – collettore delle Terme Stabiane. Indagini preliminari al risanamento idrogeologico." In *Nuove ricerche archeologiche nell'area vesuviana (scavi 2003–2006)*. Ed. by P. G. Guzzo and M. P. Guidobaldi. Studi della Soprintendenza archeologica di Pompei 25. Rome and Naples: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2008, 529–531.

Ellis et al. 2011

Steven J. R. Ellis, Allison L. C. Emmerson, Amanda K. Pavlick, and K. Dicus. "The 2010 Field Season at I.I.1–10, Pompeii: Preliminary report on the excavations." *The Journal of Fasti Online* 220 (2011). URL: <http://www.fastionline.org/docs/FOLDER-it-2011-220.pdf> (visited on 19/11/2018).

Emme 2013

Burkhard Emme. *Peristyl und Polis: Entwicklung und Funktionen öffentlicher griechischer Hofanlagen*. Urban Spaces 1. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013.

Eschebach 1979

Hans Eschebach. *Die Stabianer Thermen in Pompeji*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1979.

Fagan 1999

Garrett G. Fagan. *Bathing in Public in the Roman World*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1999.

Gasparini 2011

Valentino Gasparini. "Cronologia ed architettura dell'Iseo di Pompei: una proposta di schema verificabile." *Vesuviana* 3 (2011), 67–88.

Hoffmann 1993

Peter Hoffmann. *Der Isis-Tempel in Pompeji*. Münster: Lit, 1993.

Jashemski 1993

Wilhelmina F. Jashemski. *The Gardens of Pompeii*. Vol. 2: Appendices. New Rochelle, NY: Caratzas, 1993.

Känel 2010

Rudolf Känel. "Bemerkungen zum Terrakotta-Bauschmuck hellenistischer Wohnhäuser in Mittelitalien." In *Etruskisch-italische und römisch-republikanische Häuser*. Ed. by M. Bentz and C. Reusser. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2010, 263–271.

Laurence 1994

Ray Laurence. *Roman Pompeii. Space and Society*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Maiuri 1950

Amedeo Maiuri. "Pompei. Scoperta di un edificio termale nella Regio VIII, Insula 5, nr. 36." *Notizie degli scavi di antichità* (1950), 116–136.

McDonald 2012

Katherine McDonald. "The Testament of Vibius Adiranus." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 102 (2012), 40–55.

Pender 2008

Erik Pender. "Il cosiddetto 'sacello' IX 2,1–29: Indagine stratigrafica e nuova interpretazione." In *Nuove ricerche archeologiche nell'area vesuviana (scavi 2003–2006)*. Ed. by P. G. Guzzo and M. P. Guidobaldi. Rome and Naples: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2008, 540–541.

Pesando 1997

Fabrizio Pesando. "Il fregio fittile con scene di battaglia da Pompei. Ipotesi di localizzazione." *Ostraka* 1 (1997), 51–62.

Pesando 2000

Fabrizio Pesando. "Edifici pubblici antichi nella Pompei augustea. Il caso della Palestra sannitica." *Römische Mitteilungen* 107 (2000), 155–175.

Pesando 2002–2003

Fabrizio Pesando. "Le terme repubblicane di Pompei. Cronologia e funzione." *Annali di archeologia e storia antica* 9–10 (2002–2003), 221–243.

Pesando and Guidobaldi 2006

Fabrizio Pesando and Maria P. Guidobaldi. *Pompei. Oplontis. Ercolano. Stabiae*. Rome and Bari: Laterza, 2006.

Pesando, Tosti, and Zanella 2010

Fabrizio Pesando, Francesco Tosti, and Sandra Zanella. "Scavi nell'insula VIII, 6." In *Rileggere Pompei. III. Ricerche sulla Pompei Sannitica. Campagne di scavo 2006–2008*. Ed. by F. Pesando. Quaderni di Studi Pompeiani 4. Rome: Bardi, 2010, 149–162.

Poehler and Ellis 2011

Eric E. Poehler and Steven J. R. Ellis. "The 2010 Season of the Pompeii Quadriporticus Project. The Western Side." *The Journal of Fasti Online* 218 (2011), 1–10. URL: <http://www.fastionline.org/docs/FOLDER-it-2011-218.pdf> (visited on 19/11/2018).

Poehler and Ellis 2012

Eric E. Poehler and Steven J. R. Ellis. "The 2011 Season of the Pompeii Quadriporticus Project. The Southwestern, Southern, Southeastern and Northern Sides." *The Journal of Fasti Online* 249 (2012), 1–12. URL: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/33151446.pdf> (visited on 19/11/2018).

Poehler and Ellis 2013

Eric E. Poehler and Steven J. R. Ellis. "The Pompeii Quadriporticus Project. The Eastern Side and Colonnade." *The Journal of Fasti Online* 284 (2013), 1–14. URL: <http://www.fastionline.org/docs/FOLDER-it-2013-284.pdf> (visited on 19/11/2018).

Poehler and Ellis 2014

Eric E. Poehler and Steven J. R. Ellis. "The 2013 Season of the Pompeii Quadriporticus Project. Final Fieldwork and Preliminary Results." *The Journal of Fasti Online* 321 (2014). URL: <http://www.fastionline.org/docs/FOLDER-it-2014-321.pdf> (visited on 19/11/2018).

Ramallo Asensio 2000

S F. Ramallo Asensio. "La porticus post scaenam en la arquitectura teatral Romana. Introducción al tema." *Anales de prehistoria y arqueología. Universidad de Murcia* 16 (2000), 87–120.

Richardson 1988

Lawrence Richardson. *Pompeii. An Architectural History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.

Rix 2002

Helmut Rix. *Sabellische Texte*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 2002.

Schmölder-Veit 2009

Andrea Schmölder-Veit. *Brunnen in den Städten des westlichen Römischen Reiches*. Palilia 19. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2009.

Stannard 2005

Clive Stannard. "The Monetary Stock at Pompeii at the Turn of the Second and First Century BC: Pseudo-Ebusus and Pseudo-Massalia". In *Nuove ricerche archeologiche a Pompei ed Ercolano. Atti del convegno internazionale, Roma 28–30 novembre 2002*. Ed. by P. G. Guzzo and M. P. Guidobaldi. Studi della Soprintendenza archeologica di Pompei 10. Naples: Electa, 2005, 120–143.

Tricarico 2013

Luigi Tricarico. "La Palestra Sannitica: rilievo e analisi tecnica delle strutture". In *Pompei/Messene: il Doriforo e il suo contesto*. Ed. by V. Franciosi and P. Thémelis. Naples: Università degli Studi Suor Orsola Benincasa, 2013, 49–64.

Trümper 2013

Monika Trümper. "Urban Context of Greek Public Baths". In *Greek Baths and Bathing Culture: New Discoveries and Approaches*. Ed. by S. Lucore and M. Trümper. BABESCH. Supplement 23. Leuven: Peeters, 2013, 33–72.

Trümper 2015

Monika Trümper. "Modernization and Change of Function of Hellenistic Gymnasia in the Imperial Period: Case-studies Pergamon, Miletus, and Priene". In *Das Kaiserzeitliche Gymnasium*. Ed. by P. Scholz and D. Wiegandt. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015, 167–221.

Trümper 2017

Monika Trümper. "Water Management of the Stabian Baths at Pompeii: A Reassessment". In *Wasserwesen zur Zeit des Frontinus. Bauwerke – Technik – Kultur, Frontinus Symposium Trier Mai 2016*. Ed. by G. Wiplinger and W. Letzner. Leuven: Peeters, 2017, 257–272.

Vetter 1953

Emil Vetter. *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1953.

Volpicella 2006–2007

D. Volpicella. "Cuma. Le terme centrali. Un preliminare inquadramento cronologico delle fasi edilizie". *Annali di archeologia e storia antica* 13–14 (2006–2007), 187–220.

Illustration and plate credits

ILLUSTRATIONS: 1 M. Trümper after De Waele 2001, 8 pl. 3. 2 M. Trümper after De Waele 2001, 317 pl. 41 and Tricarico 2013, 213 pl. II. 3 C. Rummel. 4–5 C. Brünenberg. 6 D. Esposito. 7 M. Trümper. **PLATES:** 1 M. Trümper after

Pesando 2000, 164 fig. 5. 2 Poehler and Ellis 2013, 11 fig. 16. 3 C. Brünenberg. 4 C. Brünenberg. 5 M. Trümper after Fig. 3, Pl. 4, and Jashemski 1993, 91 plan 29.

MONIKA TRÜMPER

Dr. phil. (Munich 1995), Habilitation (Heidelberg 2005), is a Professor of Classical Archaeology at the Freie Universität Berlin and Spokesperson of the Berlin Graduate School of Ancient Studies for the FU. Her research focuses on Hellenistic and Roman architecture and urban studies, particularly domestic architecture, bathing culture, agorai/porticus, and commercial architecture. She did fieldwork in Delos and currently has excavation projects in Morgantina and Pompeii.

Prof. Dr. Monika Trümper
Freie Universität Berlin
Institut für Klassische Archäologie
Fabeckstr. 23–25
14167 Berlin, Germany
E-Mail: monika.truemper@fu-berlin.de

Rebecca Henzel, Monika Trümper

Crowded or Empty Spaces? The Statuary Decoration of the ‘Palaestrae’ in Pompeii and Herculaneum

Summary

While the sculptural decoration of palaestrae and gymnasia in the eastern Mediterranean has received significant research attention, the topic has not been studied comprehensively for equivalent structures in the west. This paper investigates the sculptural decoration of the Samnite Palaestra and the Large Palaestra in Pompeii as well as the Palaestra at Herculaneum. It assesses the existence and character of sculptural programs and the much-debated question of whether the sculptures were appropriate for an athletic setting or are even adequate to confirm the contested identification as palaestrae of these buildings. The sculptural decoration of all three buildings is shown to have differed significantly from that of their eastern counterparts. This suggests that the appellation of these ‘palaestrae’ may merit a reconsideration.

Keywords: Pompeii; Herculaneum; Samnite Palaestra; Great Palaestra; Large Palaestra; sculptural decoration

Während die Skulpturenausstattung von Palästran und Gymnasien im östlichen Mittelmeer in der Forschung viel Aufmerksamkeit erfahren hat, ist das Thema für die westlichen Pendants bislang nicht umfassend untersucht worden. Dieser Beitrag analysiert die Skulpturenausstattung der Samnitischen Palästra und der Großen Palästra in Pompeji sowie der Palästra in Herculaneum. Existenz und Charakter der Skulpturenprogramme werden untersucht ebenso wie die umstrittene Frage, ob die Skulpturen angemessen für die Sportbauten waren und sogar die problematische Identifizierung dieser Bauten als Palästran bestätigen können. Es zeigt sich, dass die Skulpturenausstattung aller drei Bauten erheblich von der in östlichen Pendants differiert. Dies legt nahe, die Benennung dieser ‚Palästran‘ zu überdenken.

Keywords: Pompeji; Herculaneum; Samnitische Palästra; Große Palästra; Skulpturenausstattung

The inhabitants (of Alabanda, note of authors) were shrewd enough in politics, but they had the reputation of being stupid because of one not very great fault, inconsistency. In the gymnasium, the statues were all of politicians; in the public assembly, they were of quoit-throwers or runners or javelin-throwers. Thus the unsuitable disposition of the statues added a blemish to the city in public estimation.¹

This section of Vitruvius is frequently used by archaeologists as evidence of what was perceived as appropriate decoration for specific functional spaces in antiquity. Cicero also referred to such concepts of decoration when he commissioned a group of statues for the garden gymnasium at his villa in Tusculum.² Both quotations have often been interpreted as sufficient to reconstruct the appropriate decoration for gymnasia or, conversely, to identify a building based on its sculptural decoration.

Whereas the sculptural decoration in palaestrae and gymnasia in the eastern Mediterranean has received increased attention in recent decades,³ comparable studies for the western Mediterranean are lacking. The aim of this article is to focus for the first time on the sculptural decoration in western palaestrae and gymnasia. The situation in the west is a great deal more difficult than that of the east, because the identification of these buildings is considerably more problematic and often controversial. There are three different names in the literature for the buildings used for athletic-military training and intellectual instruction: palaestra, gymnasium, and campus. But the same building is often referred to with two different terms. Furthermore, so far only the campus type has received comprehensive study.⁴ This paper will discuss three examples of buildings that are referred to in the literature as palaestrae: the Samnite Palaestra built in Pompeii in the second century BCE, the Large Palaestra (Palestra Grande) built in Pompeii in the Augustan era, and the Palaestra at Herculaneum erected in

the late Augustan-Tiberian period.⁵ Three questions will be examined: 1. whether there was any statuary decoration at all, and how it should be characterized; 2. what role the sculptural decoration played in the identification of the buildings, i.e., whether, following Vitruvius and Cicero, a seemingly appropriate sculptural decoration is sufficient evidence for identifying a building as an athletic facility; and 3. the significance of sculptural decoration in the determination of the possible function of the buildings: whether it is possible to convincingly prove that the sculptures were suitable for certain functions. The concluding comparison of the three facilities is intended to show whether standards or striking differences in their sculptural decoration can be demonstrated and how these can be explained.

From a methodological point of view, the sculptures would need to be analyzed in context with other elements of interior decoration (wall painting, stucco, floors, furniture), but space does not allow for such analysis here. Instead, the focus will be limited to the decoration in general, in order to at least roughly situate the sculptures within that decorative ensemble. The following considerations are based solely on a critical reading of published literature.

1 The Samnite Palaestra in Pompeii

The Samnite Palaestra is located in Regio VIII of Pompeii, between the Temple of Isis, the theater, and the Foro Triangolare (Pl. 1).⁶ Originally constructed in the second century BCE, the building's current condition goes back to the imperial period (Pl. 2). The structure consists of a rectangular courtyard measuring 8 × 19 m, bounded on three sides by a portico with 5 × 8 Doric columns made of tufa; in the west, several rooms open onto the peristyle courtyard. The palaestra was accessible through a main entrance from the Via del Tempio di Iside to the north, and a narrower access with three steps

1 Vitr. 7.5.6: Alabandis satis acutos ad omnes res civiles haberi, sed propter non magnum vitium indecentiae insipientes eos esse iudicatos, quod in gymnasio eorum quae sunt statuæ omnes sunt causas agentes, foro discos tenentes aut currentes seu pila ludentes. Ita indecens inter locorum proprietates status signorum publice civitati vitium existimationis adiecit. Translation Granger 1985, 107.

2 Cic. *Att.* 1.6–8. Cf. Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 170–179.

3 Von den Hoff 2004; von den Hoff 2011; Mathys 2014; Kazakidi 2015; von den Hoff 2015a; von den Hoff 2015b; R. von den Hoff in this volume.

4 Borlenghi 2011.

5 Nowadays each of these designations is often put in quotes or preceded by “so-called”; such cumbersome solutions will be avoided here. The doubts about how to identify these structures are justified, however, and other appellations may be more suitable. Readers should bear these considerations in mind.

6 Cf., e.g., Coarelli 1990, 207; Pesando and Guidobaldi 2006, 60–62, and especially the recent Avagliano 2013, for more comprehensive discussion and older literature.

down from the Foro Triangolare to the west. Studies and excavations of the structure have recently confirmed that the Samnite Palaestra was renovated several times and reduced in size, especially in the east, in favor of the Temple of Isis. The time at which this massive intervention occurred is still under debate.⁷

The following arguments have been invoked to support the identification of the building as a palaestra:

1. The floor plan, with its peristyle courtyard and adjoining rooms, is reminiscent of Greek palaestrae.⁸

2. An Oscan inscription was found inside the structure, documenting the donation of a building for the Pompeian *vereiia*, a pre-Roman equivalent to the *iuventus*. This inscription is usually applied to the building, even if its exact find location, dating, and significance for the structure are disputed.⁹

3. A marble statue was found in the courtyard next to a statue base; it was identified as a copy of the Polyclitic Doryphoros and apparently was part of the decoration of the building in 79 AD.¹⁰ There was also an altar located in front of the base, and a staircase behind the base, with its last step higher than the base (Fig. 1).¹¹

This ensemble was interpreted as proof and provision for the cultic worship of the statue, which would have been crowned from the staircase and given sacrifices at the altar. Given this context, the Doryphoros was interpreted as the ideal image of an athlete.

4. In addition, the Samnite Palaestra was interpreted as part of a gymnasium or campus complex that would have been built in the second century BCE (Pl. 1). This complex is usually thought to have included the Foro Triangolare, the Terme Repubblicane, the Quadriporticus of the theater and a *domus publica*.¹²

The key question is what role to assign the statuary decoration in the discussion of the function of the structure, alongside the arguments from architecture and urban planning, as well as whether and especially when the statues were important during the approximately two-

hundred-year history of the building's use.

Of particular importance for this question is the statue of Doryphoros, which has often been cited as decisive proof of the building's designation and has as a result been ascribed to the initial decoration. But there are several problems:

– The stylistic dating of the statue made of Lunenian marble is disputed. The dating to the Augustan-Tiberian period is the most convincing, for material and stylistic reasons.¹³

– The statue's inclusion into the ensemble consisting of the base, staircase, and altar has also been frequently challenged. This is due to the discrepancy in shape and size between the cavity on top of the base, which measures 57 × 53 cm, and the plinth of the statue, which measures 55 × 66 cm.¹⁴ H. Weinstock's proposal to explain this difference by restoring the rear part of the base has received a mixed response in the literature and is not unanimously accepted.¹⁵

– Furthermore, the staircase of the ensemble is on top of the drain channel that conducted rainwater from the shed roof of the southern portico. Even if the water could flow under the stairs, this ensemble will hardly have been part of the initial decoration of the palaestra. It is certain, however, that the ensemble was set up before the palaestra was reduced in size: it was prominently built in the axis of the entrance from the Via del Tempio di Iside, which opened onto the exact center of the original peristyle courtyard. In addition, the ensemble of the base, staircase, and altar is predominantly and convincingly dated to pre-Augustan times because of the tufa used and the profiles.

7 On the research discussion, cf. M. Trümper in this volume, note 83.

8 Avagliano 2013 for older literature.

9 Vetter 1953, 49–50, no. 11. On *iuventus* i. a. see Della Corte 1924, 46–60; on *vereiia* i. a. Avagliano 2007, 155–170; Avagliano 2013.

10 Naples, National Archaeological Museum, inv. 6011. Found on 13 April, 3 and 17 August 1797. H. 2 m.

11 H. of base: 1.42 m; h. of steps: 1.87 m; h. of altar: 1.10 m. Cf. Weinstock 1997.

12 For detail and criticism see M. Trümper in this volume.

13 E.g., in Zanker 1974, 8; Zanker 1979, 298–299; and recently again in Avagliano 2013, 70–72 with older literature. Since the extensive refurbish-

ments in the area of the Foro Triangolare and in the Samnite Palaestra are usually dated to the Augustan era, the Doryphoros is most likely to have been erected in this context, i.e., in the Augustan era; it will therefore be assumed to date to this period in what follows.

14 The first to doubt they went together was Mau 1900, 184; cf. also Della Corte 1924, 48; Hartswick 1995; La Rocca, M. De Vos, and A. De Vos 1994, 166.

15 Proposal in Weinstock 1997, esp. fig. 73. 2; accepted by, e.g., Coarelli 2001, 103; Pesando 2000, 155–157; Pesando and Guidobaldi 2006, 61; Borlenghi 2011, 218; dismissed with detailed reasoning by Avagliano 2007, 137–144.



Fig. 1 Pompeii, Samnite Palaestra, ensemble with statue base, altar, and stairs, from the west.

Several options are conceivable in view of these complex findings:

1. The tufa base was already inside the palaestra in the pre-Augustan era and originally supported another statue, one that cannot be identified and in any case was no longer inside the building by 79 CE. This statue was replaced in the Augustan era by the Doryphoros figure.

2. The base was not from the palaestra originally, but was brought there to be reused for the installation of the Doryphoros.

3. The Doryphoros was never installed on this base. A different marble statue stood on the base, one that by 79 CE was no longer in the building.

Serious objections can be raised to all these options: The first and second options do not explain the discrepancy between the base and statue plinth. Another argument against the second solution is that in the early imperial era, one would hardly have installed a high-quality

marble statue on a secondhand tufa base. The third option seems plausible at first, especially since the statue shows no signs of weathering, which one would expect if the statue had been exposed to the elements for seventy to a hundred years. The state of preservation of the statue thus suggests that it was installed in the shelter of one of the porticoes or in one of the western rooms.¹⁶ But it remains unclear why of all the statues, the one that was to be reconstructed on the tufa base and clearly had the most prominent position and significance in the building was the statue that by 79 CE was no longer in the palaestra. It may have been a presumably monumental, over-life-size marble statue depicting a hero, god, or emperor entitled to cultic honors. A monumental marble statue would have been possible in pre-Augustan Pompeii, if rather rare, and correspondingly valuable.

¹⁶ Avagliano 2007, 144, asserts that there are two holes on the back of the statue to attach it to a wall.

For the Doryphoros, then, it must be clarified where and how it was installed from the Augustan period until 79 CE. Even though the statue stands securely on the plinth and the plinth is smoothly worked, at least at the front, it is hardly likely that the statue was installed directly on the ground, especially since neither the porticoes nor the rooms in the west have permanent floors. But a suitable base – preferably reconstructed as an inscribed base made of or revetted with marble – has not been found. These conspicuously missing finds, which make option three problematic, have not been systematically addressed in the literature. Similarly problematic lacunas concern other parts of the building, so the problem will be summarized further below for all findings.

Finally, for the Doryphoros, it should be pointed out that this statue once again gained crucial significance for the identification of the building as a palaestra after another Doryphoros replica was found in the gymnasium at Messene. This replica was identified as a representation of Theseus based on the description by Pausanias.¹⁷ Others have interpreted the Doryphoros as Achilles,¹⁸ or as a generic statue of an ideal athlete. A recent proposal suggested putting a sword and shield in his hands.¹⁹ Even though no other Doryphoros statues have been found in palaestrae or gymnasia to date,²⁰ the two replicas in Pompeii and Messene are considered to be typical and appropriate decoration for such facilities.²¹ All the same, the findings in Pompeii show that the Doryphoros cannot be claimed to determine the function of the original building. Its “late” installation, however, could reveal much about the seldom discussed function of the building in the post-Samnite period, i.e., in Roman Pompeii.

The excavation reports suggest that another base with a statue was installed in the Samnite Palaestra dur-

ing the Augustan period. Only the inscribed marble revetment slab of a base was found, honoring Marcus Lucretius Decidianus Rufus. But today it no longer stands in the place where it was found.²² The offices and honors listed on this and other bases discovered in Pompeii attest that Marcus Lucretius Decidianus Rufus was one of the most important local elites in the Augustan period.²³ The inscription explicitly states that the statue was reinstalled (*reposit*), which F. Pesando has tied to repairs done after the earthquake of 62 CE: Marcus Decidius Pilonius Rufus may have restored the palaestra and the statue of Marcus Lucretius Decidianus Rufus after the earthquake, while Marcus Lucretius Decidianus Rufus could have financed the reconstruction of the palaestra in the Augustan period. This would testify to the palaestra’s uninterrupted significance for the Pompeian elite until 79 CE, which would also be reflected in the carefully maintained sculptural decoration.²⁴ Since the top of the base is not preserved, the decision cannot be made as to whether the statue of Decidianus Rufus was made out of marble or of bronze, as was much more customary for honorific statues in Pompeii. The exact location where the statue was erected cannot be reconstructed either, since conclusive remains, such as a masonry foundation or core, have not been preserved or documented.²⁵ The limited space in the Samnite Palaestra offers few possibilities. A marble statue would have been better off reconstructed in one of the porticoes or the rooms; a bronze statue could have stood in the open courtyard without a problem.²⁶

In summary, at least two, if not three statues can be reconstructed for the Samnite Palaestra,²⁷ each of which comes with its own significant problems: 1. a marble statue connected with the tufa ensemble of a base, altar, and set of stairs that was presumably installed in the Sam-

17 Paus. IV,32,1; Themelis 1998–1999.

18 Hauser 1909. On the discussion see Lorenz 1991; Schwarzer 1995; Franciosi 2013; Avagliano 2007.

19 Franciosi 2013, esp. 24 fig. 27b.

20 Kreikenbom 1990, 59–94, 163–180.

21 Cf., e.g., Yegül 1993, 382: “A slightly over-life-size marble copy of Doryphoros by Polyclitus found inside the palaestra (it might or might not have been set on the base) underlines the agonistic character of the building.”

22 Pesando 2000, 163–175. CIL X, 851: M[arcus] Lucretius Decid[ianus] / Rufus [duo]vor [terti]um quinq[ennalis] / pontif[ex] trib[unus] mil[itum] / a populo prae[fectus] fab[rum] / M[arcus] Decidius Pilonius / Rufus reposit.

23 Pesando 2000, 163–171; biography in Franklin 2001, 29–33.

24 Pesando 2000, 171–174.

25 Pesando 2000, 170, explicitly mentions that the inscribed marble panel belonged to a “base di statua in cementizio” whose exact find location in the palaestra is not mentioned in the excavation diary of F. La Vega.

26 The tufa ensemble preserved in situ, however, shows that marble statues were also installed in the open air.

27 Pesando 2000, 168, suspects that two herms, donated by Decidianus Rufus in the Augustan era, were additionally installed in the palaestra. They were supposed to have been reused in neighboring Iseion after 62 CE as framing for a niche. It would be striking in this case, however, had the sculptures associated with Decidianus suffered a different fate after 62 CE: whereas his honorific statue was specifically repaired and reinstalled in the Samnite Palaestra after 62 CE, his sanctified herms were removed from the palaestra.

nite period, but as an addition to the original building; 2. the statue of Doryphoros, probably dedicated in Augustan times, which was positioned in an unknown location or perhaps on the already existing tufa base; 3. the statue honoring Decidianus Rufus, which was consecrated by unknown benefactors in a similarly unknown location, perhaps in the Augustan period, and reinstalled by Marcus Decidius Pilonius Rufus after 62 CE. Because components of all three statue installations were found, and the statue of Decidianus Rufus should still have been standing after 62 CE, all three were probably intended to be seen simultaneously; this would mean that the Samnite Palaestra, which was relatively small from the start and was subsequently made even smaller, had a comparatively rich sculptural decoration, beginning in the Augustan period.

On the other hand, the state of preservation at the time of the excavation must be discussed much more critically than has occurred in the literature: Why has the marble statue from the tufa ensemble not been found, or the marble or bronze statue of Decidianus Rufus, or the masonry core of its statue base and the (masonry and marble-clad or even solid marble) base of the Doryphoros? The missing marble or bronze elements could be explained by looting right after the eruption of Vesuvius, even if there is no concrete evidence of this practice in the case of the Samnite Palaestra. In any case, the marble Doryphoros statue and the marble inscription for Decidianus Rufus would have evaded the grasp of the treasure hunters. Looting is not a conclusive explanation for the fact that no masonry core for a statue base has been found, however, since such masonry base cores have survived at the Forum, the site of intensive post-79 pillaging.²⁸

This begs the question of whether the Samnite Palaestra was even fully decorated, fit for use, or being used in 79 CE, and whether all the sculpture components found here really belonged to the building; perhaps they were only stored there, for reasons unknown. This primarily concerns the strangely isolated marble inscription to Decidianus Rufus, but would also theoretic-

cally apply to the Doryphoros statue. The statue-less tufa ensemble would suggest that the building had lost its original significance (and function?) around 79 CE.

Given this background, the statuary decoration of the Samnite Palaestra is to be evaluated with great caution and cannot be claimed to identify the function of this building with any certainty. The prominently placed, carefully planned, and – until 79 CE – well-preserved tufa ensemble proves only that a statue was erected here and was the object of cult worship, at least for a time. This statue could have been the only “decorative” element in the palaestra, which provides no evidence of any permanent floors and wall paintings, and only little other furniture.²⁹

2 The Large Palaestra in Pompeii

The Large Palaestra is located directly alongside Pompeii’s amphitheater (Pl. 3).³⁰ The 141.75 × 107.4 m complex, presumably built in the Augustan period, consists of a peristyle courtyard with a surface area of 127 × 100 m, framed on three sides by a raised portico of brick columns with composite capitals of tufa.³¹ In the center of the open space is a rectangular swimming pool (34.55 × 22.25 m) with a depth of 1 to 2.60 m. Trees were planted in double rows in front of the porticoes. The entire complex was surrounded by a crenellated wall. While the accessibility of the complex has not been fully clarified, at least three openings identified as main entrances led to the amphitheater and there were smaller entrances on the north and west sides.³² The vast peristyle courtyard was only partially framed by rooms, on two sides: a latrine to the south that was added later, and a centrally placed exedra to the west with a secondary room. This exedra includes a base in situ, placed at the center, which should be interpreted as the base of a statue because of its dimensions and location (Fig. 2). Only the masonry core of the base and the molded marble revetment at the foot of the base have

28 Cf. Kockel 2005; Flecker and Kockel 2008; Müller and Kockel 2011.

29 Avagliano 2013, 72 note 25 mentions a labrum that was found near the main entrance.

30 Maiuri 1939, 165–238; Delorme 1960, 436–439; Zanker 1995, 123–125; La Rocca, M. De Vos, and A. De Vos 1994, 266–268; Pesando and Guidobaldi 2006, 74–76; Borlenghi 2011, 45–47, 220–226. Maiuri 1939, 165–238, provides a detailed excavation report, but the building has not

yet been extensively studied or published.

31 The Augustan dating is based on the dating of walls (material and technology) and tree roots; Jashemski 1979, 160–161; Pesando and Guidobaldi 2006, 75; Borlenghi 2011, 224.

32 The number of access points varies according to the plans published; cf. Trümper 2008, 83 note 369; Borlenghi 2011, 220, describes ten entrances for the last use phase after 62 CE.



Fig. 2 Pompeii, Large Palaestra, base in the exedra, from the east.

survived.³³ Since the marble revetment of the base's corpus (which may have held an inscription) and the cover plate are missing, the number and nature of the statues that may have been installed here can no longer be determined. A colossal statue or a group of three statues could easily have been erected on the base, however.³⁴

The floor plan, with its large peristyle courtyard and swimming pool, is usually cited as a criterion for identifying the building as a facility for athletic activities, as are some of the abundantly preserved graffiti.³⁵ Although "Large Palaestra" (Palestra grande) has become established as its name, the building has been identified as a campus for training the Augustan *iuventus*, a "luogo destinato alla formazione fisica e intellettuale del cittadino-soldato."³⁶ But its intra-urban location and abundant and varied graffiti have given A. Borlenghi reason to assume that the complex was conceived from the beginning as a multifunctional structure, intended not only for *iuvenes* training and recreation, but as a public place for the entire population, "d'incontro deputato al divertimento e allo svago."³⁷

Against this background, the interesting and as-yet-undiscussed question arises once again of whether the hybrid concept – campus and luxurious portico-complex at the same time – is manifested in the statuary decoration, or whether the statuary decoration can confirm such a concept and perception of the building. Whereas the sculptural decoration of campi apparently remained largely limited to cult statues in exedrae or apses,³⁸ the portico-complexes (especially in Rome) were characterized by lavish decoration including sculptures, paintings, and other objects.³⁹

Only one finding indicates that statues were installed in the Large Palaestra: the aforementioned exedra, with the large base at its rear. Even with the evidence that elements of the building's decoration were renewed before 62 CE, and that repairs and additions took place after 62 CE, the exedra can be unequivocally identified as part of the original layout.⁴⁰ The intercolumnium in front of the exedra in the western portico was widened as well as decorated with pilasters and half-columns, its own staircase to the courtyard, and possibly even a gable,

33 Maiuri 1939, 174 does not specify dimensions for the surviving base, nor are these found in any later publication; according to the plan in Maiuri 1939, pl. IX, the base is 3.15 m wide and 1.30 m deep at the molded foot.

34 Cf. the dimensions of statue bases that are sure to have supported colossal statues, in Ruck 2007, 27–50 table 6–7.

35 Maiuri 1939; Zanker 1995, 123–124; Borlenghi 2011, 45–47, 220–226.

36 Pesando and Guidobaldi 2006, 75 (cit.); see esp. Borlenghi 2011, 45–47, 220–226.

37 Borlenghi 2011, 226; on the graffiti see also Langner 2001, 23, 117–118. The graffiti attest to amphitheater visitors, soldiers, slaves, teachers, doctors, hairdressers, and passersby.

38 Borlenghi 2011, passim, mentions only a few statues for the campi in the western Mediterranean; his synthesis devotes an individual chapter only to cultic sites and consecrations, Borlenghi 2011, 170–173.

39 These include the Portico of Pompey, the Porticus Liviae, the Porticus Metelli/Octaviae, and the Templum Pacis in Rome; Maucaulay-Lewis 2011; cf. also the Agora of the Italians in Delos; Trümper 2008. The Eumachia Building in Pompeii, in which few statues were set up, and the Basilica or Augusteum in Herculaneum, in which lavish sculptural decoration was found, are often compared to the rich portico-complexes in Rome; Allroggen-Bedel 2008; Trümper 2009, 49–55.

40 Borlenghi 2011, 224.

obviously to emphasize the exedra in the back.⁴¹ Borlenghi reconstructs a cult statue on the statue base and interprets the exedra as a cultic center of the complex and of the *iuvenes*, who would have worshipped Flora or another deity here.⁴² Others, by contrast, have reconstructed the statue of an emperor on the base, such as Augustus, who particularly favored the *iuvenes*.⁴³

The lack of other statues is conspicuous and requires an explanation. It is known that the complex was damaged in the earthquake of 62 CE and that renovations were still underway in 79 CE.⁴⁴ Furthermore, the discovery of the statue base suggests that this building was at least partially robbed of some of its precious materials (marble, metal) after the eruption of the volcano.⁴⁵ But neither of these phenomena can fully or satisfactorily explain the lack of decorative sculpture. If honorific statues⁴⁶ or statues of athletes, heroes, or gods had been set up here, some remains from the bases would at least have been found in or in front of the porticoes, in the intercolumniations, or out in the courtyard. As has already been explained above and has also been confirmed by the example in the exedra of the Large Palaestra, bases with masonry cores would not all have been destroyed in the earthquake and then systematically removed, nor would they have been overlooked in excavations or consistently destroyed. As a result, the lack of statuary decoration may illuminate how the complex was conceived, suggesting that it was primarily intended as a pragmatic-functional structure for athletic training. In the local context, the complex apparently had neither the function and prestige of public squares and structures such as the forum and theater (*loci celeberrimi*), where honorific statues were concentrated, nor the function and ambience of richly decorated public and private complexes

with porticoes and peristyles (*loci amoeni*), which were populated with “decorative” statues or even works of art.

The other decorations in the Large Palaestra confirm this as well: the porticoes and scarce rooms have only dirt floors; moreover, the porticoes were decorated with simple Third Style paintings, which date to the eras of Caligula or Claudius, and thus were not part of the original building. Repairs began after 62 CE, when ruined columns were mended and revetted with stucco. Some elements were highlighted architecturally, such as the entrance portals, the exedrae, and the crenelated perimeter wall. Thus, there was investment in decoration but the expense was largely limited to a pragmatic minimum. This demonstrates once again that while the structure was impressively monumental, it was conceived as a simply decorated functional building, rather than a luxurious portico-complex. This austere conceptualization does not seem to have changed during the building’s seventy to ninety years of use.

3 The Palaestra at Herculaneum

This palaestra is located east of Cardo V, at Insula Occidentalis II.⁴⁷ Although the eastern part of the complex has never been completely revealed, the various tunnel excavations have allowed the basic features of its layout to be reconstructed. The complex occupied an entire insula and extended over several terraces, following the south-to-north gradient of the topography. At the center of the palaestra is a peristyle courtyard measuring 118 x 80 m (9500 m²), framed on three sides by Corinthian columned halls and by a cryptoportico to the north (Pl. 4). The open courtyard held two large

41 Borlenghi 2011, 220.

42 Borlenghi 2011, 224.

43 Zanker 1995, 124; Pesando and Guidobaldi 2006, 76.

44 Borlenghi 2011, 224.

45 Maiuri 1939, 174 interpreted this finding as evidence that the exedra had not yet been completely restored after 62 CE with its stucco decoration and base. This is unlikely, at least with regard to the base, because the foot of the base would hardly have been installed prior to the stucco decoration, while the rest of the base’s marble revetment would have been added only later. It is likewise highly improbable that only the foot of the base had been installed when Vesuvius erupted.

46 Pesando 2000, 166–167 and Pesando and Guidobaldi 2006, 76, propose that the fragment of the inscription CIL X, 952, which documents the dedication of a public building by the duovir Marcus Lucretius Decidianus Rufus, could have referred to the Large Palaestra; Borlenghi 2011, 222, mentions two inscribed marble fragments found in the latrine and

possibly installed in the Augustan era above the middle entrance in the east wall; they also commemorate a donation to the Pompeians by two men: [— —]us C(ai) [f(ilius) M(arcus) Ge]mini[us M(arci) f(ilius)] / p[ublice pom]peianis; Della Corte 1939, 303–304 no. 398 fig. 20; Della Corte 1947, 561. One could have expected that honorific statues were installed in the building for men such as these, especially since Decidianus Rufus received numerous statues in Pompeii; cf. Pesando 2000, 163–174 fig. 5.

47 Maiuri 1958, 116, 142–143; Yegül 1993; Devijver and Wouterghem 1984; Pagano 1996, 243–248; Pesando and Guidobaldi 2006, 382–384; for detailed descriptions that also take the newest research into account see Borlenghi 2011, 192–207; Esposito 2014, 47–54; Esposito 2015. Because the rooms are not uniformly designated (with numbers or letters) in the literature, the plan in pl. 4 in this paper provides letters for the rooms that are relevant for the discussion, for ease of understanding.

basins: a cross-shaped basin, placed in the center (Pl. 4: G; 5.8 × 5.5 m and 5.8 × 31.5 m, 1–1.2 m deep, with stairs in the northwest corner), and a long rectangular basin, located in front of the cryptoportico (Pl. 4: H; 30 × 3 m, 2.35 m deep). Traces of plantings were also found in the courtyard.⁴⁸ Only one small semicircular exedra (Pl. 4: D, I) presumably opened onto the south portico; the east and especially the better-known west portico, by contrast, were lined with numerous, sometimes two-storied rooms, including rooms with clear architectural emphasis (often referred to as *aula* or *aulae*, pl. 4: D, E, K).⁴⁹ The western *aula* extended over two levels and was built on the same axis as the cross-shaped basin. It had a raised apse to the west and was flanked by two symmetrical rooms (Pl. 4: J–M). The rooms to the west of this three-room group opened onto the *Cardo* as *tabernae*. The northern cryptoportico (Pl. 4: F) supported an open portico that was connected to other rooms, including a large *aula* with a vestibule that opened onto *Cardo* V (Pl. 4: N–O).⁵⁰ The peristyle courtyard, by contrast, was accessible through at least two monumental entrances in the southwest of *Cardo* V and in the northeast (probably from *Cardo* VI) (Pl. 4: A, N).

Based on the construction technique and especially the stamps on the bricks, the complex insula was interpreted as a uniformly planned and executed construction project begun in the late Augustan period and completed by 35 CE at the latest. Although it has been proved that the complex was altered after the earthquake in 62 CE, there is disagreement about the stages and exact extent of the reconstruction measures taken, which will probably not be clarified until the building has been

comprehensively studied and published.⁵¹ The main evidence for construction measures after 62 CE is a marble inscription that was found in the southwestern entrance area at *Cardo* V (Pl. 4: A–B). It dates back to 76 CE and documents that the emperor Vespasian had the Temple of Mater Deum restored after it had been destroyed in an earthquake.⁵² There is dispute over whether this inscription belonged to the palaestra, however, and where exactly it was installed, even though this information is key to understanding the function and designation of the complex.⁵³

Another imperial inscription, also found in the southwestern vestibule, memorializes two persons (*magistri?*) for restoring the sanctuary (*aedes*) of an unknown deity. The exact date of the inscription and its connection to the building complex are also unknown, as is its function; nevertheless, this inscription has been used to determine the function of the palaestra.⁵⁴

Given the floor plan's similarities with that of the Large Palaestra in Pompeii – and especially because of the peristyle courtyard with basins – the complex was initially identified as a palaestra or campus of the colonia. Even researchers who acknowledged substantial architectural differences between the two complexes in Pompeii and Herculaneum adhered to the interpretation of the site as a place for athletic training.⁵⁵ Only recently has a radically new interpretation been proposed, one which is principally based on Vespasian's dedication inscription and on the sculptural decoration:⁵⁶ that the complex served as a sanctuary for Near Eastern gods, who were worshipped here in various *sacella*; Cybele/Mater Deum, Dea Syria/Atargatis, and Isis are

48 Maiuri 1958, 136; Jashemski 1979, 162.

49 The rooms on the east side are not listed on the plan Maiuri 1958, 114 fig. 91 (here pl. 4); for these see Pagano 1996, 258 fig. 13; Borlenghi 2011, 192 fig. 86; Esposito 2015, 214 fig. 8.

50 Borlenghi 2011, 192–207, labels this part as the upper terrace, and the peristyle courtyard section as the lower terrace. For critical remarks on the plan and function of the upper terrace see Esposito 2015 with older literature.

51 For dating see Borlenghi 2011, 202; Pagano 1996, 243 reconstructs only one renovation after 62 CE; Monteix 2010 posits two phases, one immediately after 62 CE and one in 70–75 CE. Despite extensive recent research, the building has to be fully published.

52 CIL X, 1406; marble slab, 3.25 × 0.56 m; IMP CAESAR VESPASIANUS AUG PONTIF MAX / TRIB POT VII XVII P P COS VII DESIGN VIII / TEMPLUM MATRIS DEUM TERRAE MOTU CONLAPSUM RESTITUIT; Guadagno 1981, 135 no. 72; Horster 2001, 281–283 no. 1b 3, 1. On the find location, see drawing by Karl Weber in Ruggiero 1885, 231–232.

53 Arguments against linking the inscription and the building include

Maiuri 1958, 190 note 59; Pagano 1996, 245–246; Horster 2001, 282. Suggested explanations for the find location included displacement by the pyroclastic flows, as well as the inscription being stored in the vestibule. On the pyroclastic flows see Guadagno 1995.

54 AE 1980, 248: Haec op[era et?] / aede[m...] / peq[unia] s[ua...] / D[ecimus] Clau[dius...] / Sex[tus] Spu[rus].../. On the various additions and interpretations see Borlenghi 2011, 198, 205, who notes that the inscription could possibly be dated to the Augustan period and would then have referred to the repair of a late republican sanctuary that had been here before the construction of the palaestra. But this does not explain why this inscription was located in the vestibule of the palaestra in 79 CE (perhaps reused as a spoil in the construction of the palaestra?). For a summary of the research discussion see Borlenghi 2011, 203–204; Esposito 2015, 224–226.

56 Karl Weber proposed the interpretation as a sanctuary (“Palacio della Vénere ó Vespasiano ó Madre de los Deos”) in 1757; cf. Ruggiero 1885, 231–232, but Maiuri rejected it after the complex had been comprehensively uncovered; Maiuri 1958, 118.

No.	Object	Designation	Find location (references to rooms from fig. 6)	Dimensions	Dating	Material	Literature
1	Statue	Hermes Richelieu type with portrait head	Courtyard, north corner	1.76 m	Flavian	Marble	Pagano 1996, 247, 260 fig. 16; Borlenghi 2011, 198, 200
2	Statue + base	Aphrodite Fréjus type	Portico, northeast corner (E)	1.76 m; base: 1.15 x 0.55 x 0.455 m	Mid-1st cent. CE	Marble	Pagano 1996, 247, 260 fig. 17; Borlenghi 2011, 200
3	Base	?	Portico, southeast corner (D/E)	?	?	Opus vitatum	
4	Base + inscription	Isis or Hygeia?	Portico, southwest corner (C/D)	Statue: 0.60 m; base: 0.55 x 0.45 m	?	Marble, opus vitatum	Ruggiero 1885, 39; Pagano 1996, 247–248
5	Sculpture	Serpent (hydra?)	Center of cross-shaped basin (G)	2.42 m	First half of 1st cent. CE	Bronze	Guidobaldi 2005, Pappalardo 2005, Borlenghi 2011, 200
6	Fragment	Hand with object	Between basin and aula	26 cm long, 8 cm diameter	?	Marble	Pagano 1996, 248; Borlenghi 2011, 200
7	Statue	Atumn	South of rectangular basin; from upper level?	0.90 m	Ptolemaic (Borlenghi), 18th Dynasty (Botti, Tran Tam Tinh)	Basalt	Botti 1963, Tran Tam Tinh 1971, 51–52, fig. 1–2; Pagano 2000, 85–86 no. 17; Gasparini 2006, 126 no. II.82; Borlenghi 2011, 200
8	Statuette	Isis	Entrance area (B)	0.095 m	150–100 BCE	Bronze	Tran Tam Tinh 1971, 61–62 no. 7; Gasparini 2006, 127 no. II.86; Borlenghi 2011, 201
9	Statuette	Harpokrates	Entrance area (B)	0.08 m	1st cent. CE	Bronze	Tran Tam Tinh 1971, 69–70 no. 25; Gasparini 2006, 126 no. II.86; Borlenghi 2011, 201
10	Statuette	Bes	Northwest portico	0.195 m	2nd cent. BCE (Tran Tam Tinh), Claudian-Neronian (Pagano)	Bronze	Tran Tam Tinh 1971, 76 no. 46; Pagano 2000, 105–106; Gasparini 2006, 127 no. II.85; Borlenghi 2011, 201
11	Statuette	Aphrodite	Entrance area (B)	0.175 m	?	Bronze	Accademia ercolanese 1771, 52–53, pl. 14–15; Borlenghi 2011, 201
12	Statuette	Hermes	Entrance area (B)	0.11 m	?	Bronze	Accademia ercolanese 1771, 123–125, pl. 33–34; Borlenghi 2011, 201
13	Statuette	Herales	Entrance area (B)	0.13 m	?	Bronze	Accademia ercolanese 1771, 83–85, pl. 22–23; Borlenghi 2011, 201

Tab. 1 Sculptures from the Palæstra at Herculaneum

named. Vespasian's dedication inscription would have been located above the southwestern entrance (Pl. 4: A) and consequently would have been relevant to the entire complex, even though the Mater Deum was worshipped only in the western *aula* (Pl. 4: K), whereas Isis's sanctuary has been allocated on the upper terrace or on the lower terrace, perhaps next to the Mater Deum.

Borlenghi even reconstructed a chronological sequence of the cults: the first to be venerated would have been Cybele, popular under Augustus, along with Dea Syria, who was frequently associated with Cybele and whose worship would have been supported primarily by the northern basin used for fish farming (Pl. 4: H); Vespasian would have reestablished this sanctuary – in deliberate imitation of Augustus – and at the same time associated it with the imperial cult; he also would have introduced the cult of Isis during his reign, a cult that had still been unpopular under Augustus. The monumentality of the complex in the small town of Herculaneum, however, suggests that even under Augustus, the imperial cult may have been associated with Cybele's.⁵⁷

The complex nature of the function of the Palaestra at Herculaneum cannot be discussed in detail here. Instead, the focus below will be on the question of what an analysis of the sculptural decoration can contribute to the discourse on how to determine the function of the complex: whether there are clear indications of use as a sanctuary, an athletic facility, or even some other concept. For a better understanding of the discussion to follow, all documented and published sculptural finds have been compiled in a table and their find locations mapped (Tab. 1; Pl. 5).⁵⁸

Statues were installed in three corners of the portico: in the northeast, a statue of the Aphrodite Fréjus type was found next to an opus vittatum base (Tab. 1 no. 2, fig. 7 no. 2; Fig. 3).⁵⁹

In the southeast corner is another base in situ,

but neither the inscription nor the statue have survived (Tab. 1 no. 3, Pl. 5 no. 3). There is also a base in the southwest corner which has been connected with a marble inscription fragment (Tab. 1 no. 4; Pl. 5 no. 4): IULIA HYGIA/EX VISU.⁶⁰ According to the inscription, Julia Hygia acted as the donor of the statue. It can be gathered from the formulation *ex visu* that a statue of the gods was being donated.⁶¹ An under-life-size statue, now missing, was discovered in close proximity to the base by Karl Weber in 1757. He described the statue as a female holding a serpent in her hand, meaning that she could have represented Isis or Hygieia.⁶²

A statue of the Hermes Richelieu type was found with a Flavian portrait head in the northwest corner of the open courtyard (Tab. 1 no. 1; Pl. 5 no. 1; Fig. 4).⁶³

A five-headed bronze serpent winding around a narrow tree trunk had been installed in the center of the cross-shaped basin (Tab. 1 no. 5; pl. 5 no. 5). This has been identified as the hydra of Lerna and, in the context of the palaestra, considered it to be an incentive for the youths to emulate Herakles.⁶⁴ There have also been suggestions of ties to Rome, where Agrippa used a hydra statue to decorate a fountain next to the Basilica Julia, the Lacus Servilius.⁶⁵

In addition, a colossal left hand made of marble, holding an object painted reddish-brown, was found between the cross-shaped basin and the western *aula absidata* (Tab. 1 no. 6; Pl. 5 no. 6; Figs. 5–6).⁶⁶ The hand's find location and size suggest that it belonged to a statue installed in the western *aula* (Pl. 4: K). The location, size, and decoration of the *aula* and the raised apse are unanimously acknowledged in the scholarly literature as evidence that this room had a cultic function. Not only was this room located in the precise axis of the cross-shaped basin, but it was also accentuated by the design

57 Borlenghi 2011, 204–207.

58 Cf. the discussion of the decoration in Gasparini 2010; Borlenghi 2011, 198–202 with plan of distribution 199 fig. 90; Esposito 2014, 47–54; Esposito 2015.

59 Naples, National Archaeological Museum, inv. no. 5997.

60 CIL X, 929.

61 On *ex visu* see Noy 2004.

62 “...una estautita de marmol de mujer bestida con una camisa que le cubre solo el cuerpo, los brazos desnudos y las piernas; es alta de 2 pal. y 4 on. bien conserbada, con la mano derecha tiene en la barba y el otro brazo como cruzado debajo del derecho y tiene con la mano izquierda una serpiente y las piernas tiene como cruzadas estando en pié.” Weber cited in Ruggiero 1885, 249; Borlenghi 2011, 200.

63 The matching base was missing, which led Guidobaldi 2005, 145 to suspect that the statue had come from the upper floor.

64 Herculaneum, Deposito archeologico Inv. 3945/79242. Dazu Guidobaldi 2005; Pappalardo 2005, 70–71.

65 Festus 372L. Guidobaldi 2005, 145; Borlenghi 2011, 206, argues that the hydra may have had no symbolic function, and therefore a purely decorative one.

66 Magazzino archeologico di Ercolano inv. 1623. Pagano 1996, 248; Borlenghi 2011, 200. No images of the hand have been published until now; the authors are grateful to Domenico Esposito for pointing out that this hand was in the magazine, as well as for his help with the request for publication rights.



Fig. 3 Herculaneum, Palaestra, Aphrodite Fréjus type.



Fig. 4 Herculaneum, Palaestra, Hermes Richelieu type.

of the west portico (its own staircase, a broadened intercolumniation, etc.), like the exedra in the Large Palaestra of Pompeii. The dimensions of the apse (4.1 m wide) suggest that a monumental statue or a group of statues was installed here; Cybele/Mater Deum and the emperor have been proposed as subjects of cult worship.⁶⁷ The question is whether the interpretation of the marble hand can be of more assistance with this question. The hand was previously interpreted as part of an acrolith

statue and therefore a colossal statue of the gods, which was installed in the apse.⁶⁸ The question of whether it is an acrolith statue is of particular interest, since such statues are only expected to be found in a sanctuary. But the hand does not favor the acrolith statue interpretation, since the surviving part extends well beyond the wrist suggesting that a garment had covered the arm up to this point.⁶⁹ In addition, the dowel hole at the end of the fragment is formed in the way one would expect

⁶⁷ Maiuri 1958, 124; imperial cult; Borlenghi 2011, 160; Mater Deum.

⁶⁸ Pagano 1996, 248. A more detailed discussion is needed as to why the hand was not found inside the apse and why only part of the statue was preserved.

⁶⁹ On acrolith statues and attachments in general see Claridge 1990; Häger-Weigel 1997; Despiniš 2004; Schäfer, Schmidt, and Osanna 2015, 761–

763. A cut above the wrist is rather unusual for acrolith statues; usually the entire arm is attached. See Häger-Weigel 1997. An example of an acrolith statue with the hands preserved to above the wrists is one of the archaic acrolith statues from Morgantina, but the dowel holes are designed differently and the marble hands were probably attached to the wooden frame with wooden dowels; cf. Marconi 2008, 9–10 figs. 5–10.



Fig. 5 Herculaneum, Palaestra, marble hand.



Fig. 6 Herculaneum, Palaestra, marble hand.

of stone attachments for marble or limestone statues:⁷⁰ the surface is smooth and the dowel hole very narrow. A marble arm from Pantelleria with comparable attachment points can be cited as a parallel to the marble hand from Herculaneum.⁷¹ Since this arm of the Pantelleria statue has been interpreted as an intentional addition to a marble statue, an analogous interpretation is also possible for the hand from Herculaneum.

The reddish-brown painted object in the hand merits special attention as well:⁷² it is a flat, rectangular object surrounded by three fingers (middle finger to little finger) in such a way that it can only be seen on the palm of the hand under the bent fingers (Fig. 5). The continuation between the extended index finger and the outstretched thumb, by contrast, is easy to see. The object juts out between the index and middle finger in particular, as well as between the thumb and index finger,

and the reddish-brown paint has been well preserved in both these parts. Because the hands and fingers of statues survive so rarely and are often substituted with modern additions, it is not easy to find comparisons for this hand position. Numerous conceivable attributes can be excluded, however, such as a lance, a bow, a lightning bolt, a club, a sistrum, a patera, and even a plectrum, which was usually held in the right hand. Two narrow edges of the object have no reddish-brown color: next to the little finger, and on the slanted edge between the thumb and index finger; by contrast, there are traces of color on the straight edge between the thumb and index finger and the straight edge between the index and middle finger. Since the surface of the unpainted edges has been smoothed, however, these edges cannot be reliably identified as broken edges of a partially preserved object without closer study. The partially preserved object may

70 Cf. Häger-Weigel 1997, 46–55; Claridge 1990, esp. 147–151 with pictures; more recent work on acrolith or marble statues is in Schäfer, Schmidt, and Osanna 2015, 761–763. The closest resemblance is in the surface treatment Claridge 1990, 150 fig. 21a. It should be noted, however, that previous research has dealt primarily with the heads of acrolith statues. Attached limbs, particularly hands, have rarely been addressed because of

the state of their preservation.

71 Schäfer, Schmidt, and Osanna 2015, 738 no. 20 fig. 20a–d, with discussion 761–763.

72 Pagano 1996, 248 refers to this as a “tavoletta colorata” without further explanation or discussion.

be able to be completed as a sword, which a male statue would hold in his left hand. The sword blade would have continued below the little finger and palm; where exactly the pommel of the sword was and how it was held would have yet to be clarified.⁷³ Even if only the complete publication of the hand can clarify the questions raised here, the following must be noted for the question being posed: The hand can be interpreted as part of a colossal marble statue; although the object held by the statue cannot be determined with certainty, typical attributes of some gods (Cybele, Isis, Herakles) can at least be excluded. If the object was a sword, the statue may have depicted an emperor.

A black basalt statue of the sitting Atoum was found south of the northern basin, in the peristyle courtyard, and assigned to the upper terrace (Tab. 1 no. 7; Pl. 5 no. 7).⁷⁴ An inscription in hieroglyphics names the statue as Atoum, god of Heliopolis and Aha. Unusually, there is a hole underneath the left shoulder, which may have been used for transport or as a waterspout. This is uncommon among Egyptian statues and would therefore have come from a Roman redesign.⁷⁵

In addition to the listed statues, several statuettes were found, which have mainly been used to interpret the complex as a sanctuary of Isis. In the southwestern entrance, a group of statuettes was uncovered whose exact positioning in the large room cannot be reconstructed:

- Isis (Tab. 1 no. 8; fig. 7 no. 8)⁷⁶
- Harpocrates (Tab. 1 no. 9; Pl. 5 no. 9)⁷⁷
- Aphrodite (Tab. 1 no. 11; Pl. 5 no. 11)⁷⁸
- Hermes (Tab. 1 no. 12; Pl. 5 no. 12)⁷⁹
- Herakles (Tab. 1 no. 13; Pl. 5 no. 13)⁸⁰

Furthermore, a Bes statuette was found in the west portico (Tab. 1 no. 10; Pl. 5 no. 10).⁸¹ The objects with Egyptian connotations (Atoum, Bes, Isis, Harpocrates) have been grouped with other compatible objects to substantiate the theory of an Isis sanctuary. Examples include the statue donated by Julia Hygia in the southwest corner of the portico, which could have represented Isis; a small bronze base with hieroglyphics (Pl. 5, no. 15) found in Cardo V in front of the southwestern entrance (Pl. 4: A); a gold amulet from the western entrance area (Pl. 5, no. 14);⁸² and statuettes found in the *tabernae* in Cardo V.⁸³

What statements can be made about these largely heterogeneous sculptures that would help to identify the function of this building? From a methodological point of view, it would be important to examine several questions much more precisely, which cannot be done here in the detail necessary but will be briefly discussed:

- The dating of the sculptures with regard to the question of whether they can be assigned to particular phases of use of the building; whether there were uniform sculpture programs, for example; or how the process of setting up and consecrating sculptures can be reconstructed. The Flavian portrait head, for instance, shows that the mode of decoration was changed and that new or modified sculptures could be installed during the use period of the building.
- The relevance of the find locations, which so far have been variably assessed: When (and why) are finds classified as belonging to the building, as opposed to being considered as secondary deposits or translocations occurring in the Vesuvius eruption? Which finds can justifiably be claimed to have been used for the decoration of the building and can there be used

73 On the holding of swords cf. the discussion and pictures in Spalthoff 2010, pl. 81 fig. 242; Marcadé 2000, fig. 6, 7.

74 Antiquarium Herculeum inv. 2168/2169. H. 90 cm. Tran Tam Tinh 1971, 51–52 no. 1, fig. 1–2: 18. in dynasties; Pagano 1996, 245; Ptolemaic; Gasparini 2010, 234; late 4th/early 3rd cent. BCE..

75 The hole is not mentioned in the literature; the use of the statue as a waterspout would make the suspected cultic connotation obsolete.

76 Antiquarium Herculeum inv. 1421/76699.

77 Antiquarium Herculeum inv. 1420/76698.

78 Naples, National Archaeological Museum inv. 5133.

79 Naples, National Archaeological Museum inv. 5227.

80 Naples, National Archaeological Museum inv. 5270.

81 Antiquarium Herculeum inv. 1429/76707.

82 Base: Naples, National Archaeological Museum inv. 1107; 1st cent. CE; H. 0.082 m; Tran Tam Tinh 1971, 52–55 no. 2, Gasparini 2006, 126 no. II.83, Borlenghi 2011, 202; bulla d'oro: Naples, National Archaeological Museum inv. 24606; Tran Tam Tinh 1971, 81 no. 54; Gasparini 2006, 122; Borlenghi 2011, 202.

83 Sculptures from rooms that did not connect to the interior of the complex, i.e., the palaestra area, are excluded here; on this see Borlenghi 2011, 199 fig. 90, who also includes these (on p. 206) in the considerations of the function of the building. The bronze base (27 × 19 × 8 cm) would have supported a statuette or a lightweight cult object; Borlenghi 2011, 202.

for its interpretation?⁸⁴ Critical discussion is needed on what is missing here and how it can be explained. Attempts must be made to explain why the palaestra decoration has been preserved in so fragmentary a fashion, particularly in view of the fact that considerably more extensive and more completely preserved sculptural decoration has been found in numerous other buildings in Herculaneum.⁸⁵

- The relevance of the find collections: Which criteria – the quality or the quantity of certain sculptures, for example – influence the interpretation? Statuettes of Isis and Harpocrates were found in the southwestern entrance area (Pl. 4: B), but so were figures of Hermes, Aphrodite, and Herakles. Although the latter at least numerically outweighed the Egyptian gods, they have been given scant consideration in the literature.⁸⁶ Another issue in need of critical interrogation is the installation of five differently sized statuettes measuring 8 to 17 cm. What effect could small objects of this kind have even exerted on visitors within the monumental entrance hall (7.75 × 21.65 m), and should they really be used to determine the function of the entire building complex?⁸⁷ Such groups of variously sized statuettes are more typical of shrines or *lararia* in domestic or commercial contexts, but not in monumental entrances to large public buildings (*palaestrae*, sanctuaries, and others).⁸⁸
- There is much debate in research about whether sculptures had a “decorative” versus a “cultic-sacred” function and how to identify and prove this.⁸⁹ The “Aegyptiaca” are particularly worthy of mention in

this context; their importance has long been discussed in the scholarship. Recently it has been argued on a number of occasions that Egyptian motifs and depictions were not chosen for cultic reasons and should not be ascribed to the specific religious interests of those commissioning them. Rather, the introduction and dissemination of such motifs should be interpreted as an exotic fad or attributed to the practice of collecting luxury objects and works of art.⁹⁰ There must be corresponding critical interrogation of how the broadly scattered objects with Egyptian connotations and Egyptianizing elements in the wall paintings of different rooms are to be interpreted for the Palaestra at Herculaneum.⁹¹

In sum, extreme caution should be used when enlisting the heterogeneous assemblages of sculptural decoration, with their depictions of gods and heroes as well as portrait statues, to determine the function of the building. Such statues permit neither a clear confirmation nor a definitive refutation of the sanctuary thesis. In any case, however, it should be emphasized that the sculptural decoration here is significantly more extensive than its equivalents in the small Samnite Palaestra and the Large Palaestra in Pompeii.

For this reason, only the plan and typology of the entire installation can be used to identify the complex. These were already decisive for its designation as a palaestra, but received scarce consideration for interpreting it as a sanctuary of Near Eastern gods. Sanctuaries with large porticoes had been well known in the Mediterranean since the Hellenistic period and were also represented in the Vesuvius cities.⁹² The corresponding sanc-

84 For examples see, e.g., Borlenghi 2011, 202, who invokes the objects with Egyptian connotations for the reconstruction of an Isis sanctuary on the lower terraces, despite different find locations.

85 Cf., e.g., the so-called basilica or Augusteum, the so-called Basilica Noniana, the theater, or even the Villa dei Papiri; cf. the various articles in Guidobaldi 2008; some questions arising with respect to the palaestra are where the other marble limbs of the colossal (acrolith) statue reconstructed in the western *aula* (Pl. 4: K) have remained, and whether they have not yet been published or found (and why).

86 Often the Egyptian statuettes are the only ones mentioned, e.g. Tran Tam Tinh 1971; Gasparini 2006; Borlenghi 2011, 206 even establishes that the presence of the bronze statuettes of Aphrodite, Hermes, and Heracles “potrebbe essere casuale all’interno di questa sala, ma potrebbe anche denunciarne l’appartenenza, insieme alle statuette in bronzo di Iside e

Arpocrate, ad una serie di immagini sacre disposte all’entrata dell’area santuariale.”

87 The two Egyptian statuettes were the smallest, the Aphrodite statuette the largest. They are unlikely to have been conceived as a single ensemble; see table 1.

88 Fröhlich 1991; Kaufmann-Heinimann 1998, 184.

89 Decorative with possible sacred connotation; cultic as votive or cult statue; on sculptures cf., e.g., the discussion in Kreeb 1988; Neudecker 1988; Kunze 1996; Rumscheid 2006.

90 Cf., e.g., Tronchin 2006; Tronchin 2011; Pearson 2015.

91 Cf., e.g., the wall paintings in the rooms flanking the *Aula absidiata* (Pl. 4: J, M); Esposito 2014, pl. 158 fig. 1.

92 In Pompeii: Sanctuary of Apollo; Sanctuary of Venus; Sanctuary of Isis.

tuaries in Pompeii, however, included a centrally placed temple with an altar, and their landscaped open courtyards were not decorated with large basins. So far, no fixed typology has been established for sanctuaries of Cybele/Mater Deum, and no example has been clearly identified that could serve as a parallel to the Palaestra at Herculaneum.⁹³ A similar situation applies for the Dea Syria, the worship of whom can hardly be convincingly confirmed by the existence of a basin suited to fish farming; in addition, the basin was found filled with rubbish, and so was probably no longer in use after 62 CE.⁹⁴ Since Vespasian had the sanctuary renovated in 76 CE, a basin that was pivotal to the cult would certainly not have been filled with debris. Certain parallels can be invoked with respect to the Isis sanctuaries, which are the best studied among the sanctuaries of Near Eastern deities.⁹⁵ The Iseum Campense in Rome is the most salient: its Flavian construction phase has been reconstructed with a large semicircular water basin and a sizeable but paved courtyard; the numerous assigned finds, however, point much more clearly to Egyptian deities than do those in the Palaestra at Herculaneum.⁹⁶

Even though the Palaestra at Herculaneum seems to have been significantly destroyed in the Vesuvius eruption, and furthermore has been neither completely uncovered nor comprehensively published, it is important to emphasize the lack of key elements that one would expect to find in a large sanctuary with several shrines and cults: altars in particular, but also objects such as cult statues, cultic equipment, and votive deposits.

The architectural differences between the Palaestra at Herculaneum and its counterpart in Pompeii have already been widely discussed and need not be repeated here.⁹⁷ Only the striking difference in the decoration merits emphasis: the simple decoration in the Large Palaestra in Pompeii remained unchanged during its use period. The Palaestra at Herculaneum, by contrast, at least in its last phase of use, was richly decorated with various floors (*opus signinum*, *opus tessellatum*, *opus sectile*), various wall decorations (marble, Third and Fourth

Style paintings with figural picture panels) and sculptures. The Palaestra at Herculaneum clearly had more in common here with the luxury portico-complexes in Rome listed above than with the Large Palaestra in Pompeii and *campi*. Cult worship absolutely played a role in the complexes of Rome. It was practiced in centrally placed temples or *exedra*-type shrines, or could be limited to evoking a sacral atmosphere through decoration and garden and landscape settings.⁹⁸ It is important that these complexes also or even mainly served the population as “primary locations for leisured walking” in an atmosphere of *amoenitas*.⁹⁹ Shady porticoes at various levels, gardens, water basins with various functions (decoration, fish farming, swimming and wading, boating) and luxurious decoration were also typical for villas of the time, such as the nearby Villa dei Papiri, and even for townhouses, such as the Pompeii house of Octavius Quartio/Loreius Tiburtinus (II 5, 2).¹⁰⁰ Perhaps the best example to compare to Vespasian’s generous donation is the *Templum Pacis* in Rome, which included a prominently placed shrine to Pax but was also or even chiefly conceived as an extravagant complex with gardens and porticoes for the people. Perhaps it is no coincidence that Vespasian chose to restore a complex with a comparable design and designated the entire complex as a *Templum Matris Deum*. Only the complete publication of the complex can show how much was actually restored or conceptually changed in the Vespasian renovation and whether the late Augustan construction was already planned to be a portico-complex with shrine(s).¹⁰¹

At present it cannot be determined with any certainty whether the facility was ever used for athletic training; the sculptures and inscriptions provide no clear indication, at least.¹⁰² Since the cross-shaped basin in the uncovered parts had at least one staircase, apparently it could and would have been well used. The basin depth of 1–1.10 m was no lap pool by today’s standards, but it would have allowed for simple swimming and

93 Pedrucci 2009.

94 Maiuri 1958, 137; Borlenghi 2011, 160, 203, interprets the basin as evidence of the Dea Syria.

95 Kleibl 2009.

96 Kleibl 2009, 260–264.

97 Especially Yegül 1993.

98 Cf. the list of the portico facilities and portico temple facilities of this type in Maucaulay-Lewis 2011 277 Tab. 11. 3.

99 Maucaulay-Lewis 2011, 277 (cit.); 278.

100 This house was even designated a “miniature villa”; Zanker 1995, 150–162; Tronchin 2006; Tronchin 2011; Dickmann 1999 has proven that such “villa” elements were being adapted and integrated into townhouses, in various forms, from as early as the 2nd/1st cent. BCE.

101 On renovations after 62 CE, cf., e.g., Monteix 2010, 226–231 fig. 17.

102 Strikingly little graffiti were found in the building, none of which points to *iuvenes* or athletic activities; Borlenghi 2011, 198.

certainly immersion baths.¹⁰³ The question of whether such baths were to be taken as part of athletic, cultic, or leisure activities, however, must remain unanswered. In all cases, clarification is needed on who took these baths and when, as well as the form (naked, clothed), society, and context (e.g., with or without onlookers) in which the bathing could have or should have occurred, and whether other equipment and spaces were also required (e.g., changing rooms).¹⁰⁴

4 Analysis

A comparative analysis of the questions posed at the beginning of this paper yields the following picture: A statue can certainly be demonstrated to have been present in the Samnite Palaestra, and as many as three statues may have been there after 79 CE. The Large Palaestra only has evidence of one base for a statue or group of statues. Only in the Palaestra at Herculaneum did the finds of bases, large sculptures, and statuettes illustrate a relatively broad spectrum of numbers, formats, and representations, which presumably would only increase if the building were to be completely uncovered.

The two facilities in Pompeii were definitely not as lavishly decorated with sculptures and other objects as reconstructed for gymnasia in the east, based on archaeological and epigraphic finds.¹⁰⁵ With their austere functional decoration, the Pompeian buildings offered rather “empty” spaces that were eminently suitable for the *vereiia* and *iuvēnes* activities that are attested in inscriptions.¹⁰⁶ Their “spartan” decoration is not necessar-

ily attributable to cultural conventions and customs in Samnite-Hellenistic Pompeii or the Roman colonia of Pompeii, as a comparison with safely identified facilities in Solunt and Agrigent proves. From a typological standpoint, the completely excavated “gymnasium” of Solunt (the structure is more of a palaestra) and the only partially uncovered gymnasium of Agrigent exhibit significantly more commonalities with Greek gymnasia in the east than the Pompeian facilities, but no evidence of sculptural decoration has yet been found in either. Thorough investigations in the future will be needed to determine whether austerity was typical in athletic facility decoration throughout the western Mediterranean and how to explain this phenomenon. For Pompeii, what is clear is that the floor plans and sculptural decoration in the Large Palaestra show that “campus” would be a better designation for this site. Although the Samnite Palaestra differs from palaestrae in the Greek east, this designation still seems to be the most appropriate, since no Oscan terms are known that would be fit to describe *vereiia* meeting places or training locations.¹⁰⁷

The Palaestra at Herculaneum appears on the whole to have been more sparingly decorated with sculpture than the eastern gymnasia; it does not exhibit a single “appropriate” sculpture or any “suitable” object that would clearly suggest the context of an athletic facility.¹⁰⁸ Furthermore, the sculptural decoration in the local context in general is modest, to a rather striking degree, and would certainly not be classified as a space “crowded” with statues.¹⁰⁹ Since Vespasian explicitly called attention to the restoration of the facility through his inscription in 76 CE, it must have been in a usable

103 On the criteria for the use of “swimming” pools see Trümper 2017; Trümper 2018. The basin in the Large Palaestra of Pompeii was markedly deeper, up to 2.60 m, but its bottom dropped out only gradually, from the west (1 m) to the east (2.60 m). The pool was accessible via a three-step staircase that extended over the entire west side and was decidedly inimical to the swimming of laps in the longer east-west direction; Maiuri 1939, 188 fig. 14.

104 These questions would also need to be discussed in much greater detail for the Large Palaestra in Pompeii than has been the case in the literature so far.

105 Von den Hoff 2004; von den Hoff 2011; Mathys 2014; Kazakidi 2015; von den Hoff 2015a; von den Hoff 2015b; R. von den Hoff in this volume. Particularly revealing is the inventory of Kallistratos, which lists the inventory of the Delian Gymnasium (or even a part of it) for the year 156/155 BCE, including 41 marble herms, 12 bronze torches, 10 bronze shields, 60 gilded shields as girders of portraits, numerous life-size and under-life-size sculptures, and many other objects; ID 1417, A., I, l. 118–154; Morretti 1996; Morretti 1997.

For the Samnite Palaestra: the controversial Oscan inscription Vetter 1953, 49–50, no. 11; the indications in the Large Palaestra include graffiti with the verb *ludere*, a reference to various *magistri* (in charge of the *ludi iuvenales*?) and the names of centurions as well as a painted edictum munerum on the northern outer wall that gives notice of *ludi atletici*, *inter alia*; Borlenghi 2011, 225.


107 Cf. M. Trümper in this volume.

108 E.g., donations/statues of/for *iuvēnes* athletes or officials; objects like *labra* and *strigiles*; or consecrations of victory like the torches in Delos, etc. Statuettes of Hermes and Herakles (Tab. 1 no. 11–12) are appropriate to the context of a Greek gymnasium, but were also popular far beyond; their find context and their socialization, moreover – in the western vestibule (Plate 4: B) together with statuettes of Aphrodite, Isis, and Harpocrates – does not provide a clear and convincing determination of the function and identification of the building.


109 Cf., e.g., the galleries of statues found in the theater, the Basilica Noniana, the Augusteum (or so-called basilica), and the Villa dei Papiri; Guidobaldi 2008.

state at this point, even if it was not yet completely renovated. The sculptures should therefore be thoroughly representative of the functional concept of the Vespasian complex. The plan of the complex suggests that it was designed as a portico and not as a palaestra or campus. This does not rule out a sacred function, or even a (Vespasian


re-)designation as a *Templum Matris Deum* – following the model of the *Templum Pacis* in Rome. The sculptural decoration falls short of the usual reconstructions of portico-complexes in Rome, but does not contradict the function or designation proposed above.




Pl. 1 Pompeii, "campus complex" at the Foro Triangolare. 1.2. 1 Foro Triangolare (porticoes, racetrack?); 2 Palaestra Sannitica; 3 Quadriporticus; 4 Lot VIII 6, 5 (domus publica?); 5 Casa di Giuseppe II (domus publica?); 6 Republican Baths.




Pl. 2 Pompeii, Samnite Palaestra, plan.



Pl. 3 Pompeii, Large Palaestra, plan.



Pl. 4 Herculaneum, Palaestra, plan.



Pl. 5 Herculaneum, Palaestra, plan with find locations of the sculptures, rectangular: bases in situ, round: approximate find location.

Bibliography

Allroggen-Bedel 2008

Agnes Allroggen-Bedel. "L'Augusteum". In *Ercolano. Tre secoli di scoperte. Mostra Napoli 16 ottobre 2008–13 aprile 2009*. Ed. by Maria P. Guidobaldi. Milano: Electa, 2008, 34–45.

Avagliano 2007

Alessandra Avagliano. "La Palestra Sannitica di Pompei". In *Il 'Doriforo' di Policleto*. Ed. by V. Franciosi. Naples: Jovene, 2007, 127–174.

Avagliano 2013

Alessandra Avagliano. "Il ginnasio di Vibio Adirano e a vereia. Con una nota sulla domus publica di Pompei". In *Pompei/Messene: il Doriforo e il suo contesto*. Ed. by V. Franciosi and P. G. Themelis. Naples: Università degli Studi Suor Orsola Benincasa, 2013, 67–123.

Borlenghi 2011

Aldo Borlenghi. *Il Campus. Organizzazione e funzione di uno spazio pubblico in età romana. Le testimonianze in Italia e nelle Province occidentali*. Thiasos. Rivista di archeologia e storia dell'architettura antica 1. Rome: Quasar, 2011.

Botti 1963

Giuseppe Botti. "Statuetta del dio Atum da Ercolano". *Bollettino d'arte* 48 (1963), 1–4.

Claridge 1990

Amanda Claridge. *Marble. Art Historical and Scientific Perspectives on Ancient Sculpture*. Papers Delivered at a Symposium Organized by the Departments of Antiquities and Antiquities Conservation and Held at the J. Paul Getty Museum, April 28–30, 1988. Malibu, CA: J. Paul Getty Museum, 1990, 135–162.

Coarelli 1990

Filippo Coarelli. *Pompeii. Archäologischer Führer*. Bergisch Gladbach: Luebke, 1990.

Coarelli 2001

Filippo Coarelli. "Il Foro Triangolare: decorazione e funzione". In *Pompei. Scienza e Società. 250° Anniversario degli Scavi di Pompei. Atti Convegno Napoli 1998*. Ed. by P. G. Guzzo. Naples: Electa, 2001, 97–107.

Della Corte 1924

Matteo Della Corte. *Iuventus. Un nuovo aspetto della vita pubblica di Pompei finora inesplorato, studiato e ricostruito con la scorta dei relativi documenti epigrafici, topografici, demografici, artistici e religiosi*. Arpino: G. Fraioli, 1924.

Della Corte 1939

Matteo Della Corte. "Regione I. Pompei. Le iscrizioni della 'Grande Palestra' ad occidente dell'Anfiteatro". *Notizie degli scavi di antichità* 15 (1939), 239–327.

Della Corte 1947

Matteo Della Corte. "Il campus di Pompei". *Rendiconti dell'Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 8, 2 (1947), 555–568.

Delorme 1960

Jean Delorme. *Gymnasion: étude sur les monuments consacrés à l'éducation en Grèce (des origines à l'Empire Romain)*. Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 196. Paris: De Boccard, 1960.

Despinis 2004

Giorgos Despinis. *Zu Akrolithstatuen griechischer und römischer Zeit*. Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.

Devijver and Wouterghem 1984

Hubert Devijver and Frank von Wouterghem. "Der 'Campus' der römischen Städte in Italia und im Westen". *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 54 (1984), 195–206.

Dickmann 1999

Jens-Arne Dickmann. *Domus frequentata. Anspruchsvolles Wohnen im pompejanischen Stadthaus*. Studien zur antiken Stadt 4. F. Pfeil, 1999.

Esposito 2014

Domenico Esposito. *La pittura di Ercolano*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2014.

Esposito 2015

Domenico Esposito. "Un contesto di pitture inedito dalla cosiddetta palaestra di Ercolano". *Cronache ercolanesi. Bollettino del Centro internazionale per lo studio dei papiri ercolanesi* 45 (2015), 209–226.

Flecker and Kockel 2008

Manuel Flecker and Valentin Kockel. "Forschungen im Südtel des Forums von Pompei. Ein Vorbericht über die Arbeitskampagnen 2007 und 2008". *Römische Mitteilungen* 114 (2008), 271–303.

Franciosi 2013

Vincenzo Franciosi. "Il 'Doriforo' di Pompei". In *Pompei/Messene: il Doriforo e il suo contesto*. Ed. by V. Franciosi and P. G. Themelis. Mediterraneo 2. Naples: Università degli Studi Suor Orsola Benincasa, 2013, 11–47.

Franklin 2001

James L. Franklin. *Pompeis difficile est. Studies in the political life of imperial Pompei*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001.

Fröhlich 1991

Thomas Fröhlich. *Lararien- und Fassadenbilder in den Vesuvstädten. Untersuchungen zur 'volkstümlichen' pompejanischen Malerei*. Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung. Ergänzungsheft 32. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1991.

Gasparini 2006

Valentino Gasparini. "Iside a Ercolano: il culto pubblico". In *Egittomania. Iside e il mistero*. Ed. by S. De Caro. Catalogo della mostra. Napoli, 12 ottobre 2006–26 febbraio 2007. Milano: Electa, 2006, 121–125.

Gasparini 2010

Valentino Gasparini. "La 'Palaestra' d'Herculaneum: un sanctuaire d'Isis et de la Mater Deum". *Pallas* 84 (2010), 229–264.

Granger 1985 [1934]

Frank Granger, ed. and trans. *Vitruvius. On Architecture, Vol. II, Books 6–10*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985 (1934).

Guadagno 1981

Giuseppe Guadagno. "Supplemento epigrafico ercolanese". *Cronache ercolanesi. Bollettino del Centro internazionale per lo studio dei papiri ercolanesi* 11 (1981), 129–164.

Guadagno 1995

Giuseppe Guadagno. "Documenti epigrafici ercolanesi relativi ad un terremoto". In *Archäologie und Seismologie. La regione vesuviana dal 62 al 79 d.C. Problemi archeologici e simologici*. Ed. by L. Jacobelli and T. Fröhlich. Colloquium Boscoreale 26–27 November 1993. Munich: Bering & Brinkmann, 1995, 119–128.

Guidobaldi 2005

Maria P. Guidobaldi. "Fontana di bronzo raffigurante l'Idra di Lerna". In *Eureka! Il genio degli antichi*. Ed. by E. Lo Sardo. Mostra nel museo archeologico nazionale di Napoli, 11 luglio 2005–9 gennaio 2006. Naples: Electa, 2005, 144–145.

Guidobaldi 2008

Maria P. Guidobaldi, ed. *Ercolano. Tre secoli di scoperte. Mostra Napoli, 16 ottobre 2008–13 aprile 2009*. Milano: Electa, 2008.

Häger-Weigel 1997

Elisabeth Häger-Weigel. *Griechische Akrolith-Statuen des 5. und 4. Jhs. v. Chr.* Berlin: Köster, 1997.

Hartswick 1995

Kim J. Hartswick. "Head Types of the Doryphoros". In *Polykleitos, the Doryphoros and Tradition*. Ed. by W. G. Moon. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995, 161–167.

Hauser 1909

Friedrich Hauser. "Gott, Heros und Pankratiast von Polyklet". *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien* (1909), 100–117.

von den Hoff 2004

Ralf von den Hoff. "Ornamenta γυμνασίου? Delos und Pergamon als Beispielfälle der Skulpturenausstattung hellenistischer Gymnasien". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 373–405.

von den Hoff 2011

Ralf von den Hoff. *Skulpturen in Pergamon. Gymnasium, Heiligtum, Palast*. Ed. by Ralf von den Hoff and Lars Petersen. Ausstellung in der Archäologischen Sammlung der Universität Freiburg i.Br. In Verbindung mit der Antikensammlung Staatliche Museen Berlin, 6.5.–31.7.2011. Bönen: DruckVerlag Kettler, 2011.

von den Hoff 2015a

Ralf von den Hoff. "Das Gymnasium von Pergamon. Herrscherlicher und bürgerlicher Raum in der hellenistischen Polis". In *Urbane Strukturen und bürgerliche Identität im Hellenismus*. Ed. by A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann. Hellenistische Polis als Lebensform 5. Mainz: Verlag Antike, 2015, 123–145.

von den Hoff 2015b

Ralf von den Hoff. "Die Clipei aus dem Mittelsaal H des Gymnasiums von Pergamon". In *Pergamon als Zentrum der hellenistischen Kunst. Bedeutung, Eigenheiten und Ausstrahlung*. Ed. by R. Grüßinger. Petersberg: Michael Imhof Verlag, 2015, 55–63.

Horster 2001

Marietta Horster. *Bauinschriften römischer Kaiser: Untersuchungen zu Inschriftenpraxis und Bautätigkeit in Städten des westlichen Imperium Romanum in der Zeit des Prinzipats*. Stuttgart: Steiner-Verlag, 2001.

Jashemski 1979

Wilhelmina F. Jashemski. *The Gardens of Pompei: Herculaneum and the Villas destroyed by Vesuvius*. New Rochelle: Caratzas, 1979.

Kaufmann-Heinimann 1998

Annemarie Kaufmann-Heinimann. *Götter und Lararien aus Augusta Raurica: Herstellung, Fundzusammenhänge und sakrale Funktion figürlicher Bronzen in einer römischen Stadt*. Augst: Römermuseum, 1998.

Kazakidi 2015

Natalia Kazakidi. *Έργα γλυπτικής στο ελληνιστικό γυμνάσιο: εικόνες εν γυμνασίου: ηπειρωτική Ελλάδα και τα νησιά του Αιγαίου*. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 2015.

Kleibl 2009

Kathrin Kleibl. *Iseion. Raumgestaltung und Kultpraxis in den Heiligtümern gräco-ägyptischer Götter im Mittelmeerraum*. Worms: Wernersche Verlagsgesellschaft, 2009.

Kockel 2005

Valentin Kockel. "Altes und Neues vom Forum und vom Gebäude der Eumachia in Pompeji". In *Lebenswelten: Bilder und Räume in der römischen Stadt der Kaiserzeit*. Ed. by R. Neudecker and P. Zanker. Symposium am 24. und 25. Januar 2002 zum Abschluss des von der Gerda-Henkel-Stiftung geförderten Forschungsprogramms 'Stadtkultur in der römischen Kaiserzeit'. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2005, 51–72.

Kreeb 1988

Martin Kreeb. *Untersuchungen zur figürlichen Ausstattung delischer Privathäuser*. Chicago: Ares Publishers, 1988.

Kreikenbom 1990

Detlev Kreikenbom. *Bildwerke nach Polyklet: Kopienkritische Untersuchungen zu den männlichen statuarischen Typen nach polykletischen Vorbildern: Diskophoros, Hermes, Doryphoros, Herakles, Diadumenos*. Berlin: Gebrüder Mann, 1990.

- Kunze 1996**
Christian Kunze. "Die Skulpturenausstattung hellenistischer Paläste." In *Basileia. Die Paläste der hellenistischen Könige. Internationales Symposium in Berlin vom 16.12.1992 bis 20.12.1992*. Ed. by W. Hoepfner and G. Brands. Mainz: von Zabern, 1996, 109–129.
- La Rocca, M. De Vos, and A. De Vos 1994**
Eugenio La Rocca, Mariette De Vos, and Arnold De Vos. *Pompeii*. Milano: A. Mondadori, 1994.
- Langner 2001**
Martin Langner. *Antike Graffitizeichnungen: Motive, Gestaltung und Bedeutung*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001.
- Lorenz 1991**
Thuri Lorenz. "Der Doryphoros des Polyklet: Athlet, Musterfigur, politisches Denkmal oder mythischer Held?" *Nikephoros* 4 (1991), 177–190.
- Maiuri 1939**
Amedeo Maiuri. "Regione I. Pompei. Scavo della "Grande Palestra" nel quartiere dell'Anfiteatro (1935–1939)." *Notizie degli scavi di antichità* 15 (1939), 165–238.
- Maiuri 1958**
Amedeo Maiuri. *Ercolano. I nuovi scavi (1927–1958)*. Rome: Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, Libreria dello Stato, 1958.
- Marcadé 2000**
Jean Marcadé. "De cape et d'épée. A propos de l'effigie délienne de C. Ofellius Ferus." *Ktema. Civilisations de l'Orient, de la Grèce et de Rome antiques* 25 (2000), 47–54.
- Marconi 2008**
Clemente Marconi. "Gli acroliti da Morgantina." *Prospettiva* 130–131 (2008), 2–21.
- Mathys 2014**
Marianne Mathys. *Architekturstiftungen und Ehrenstatuen: Untersuchungen zur visuellen Repräsentation der Oberschicht im späthellenistischen und kaiserzeitlichen Pergamon*. Pergamenische Forschungen 16. Darmstadt: Philipp von Zabern, 2014.
- Mau 1900**
A. Mau. *Pompeii in Leben und Kunst*. Leipzig: Engelmann, 1900.
- Maucaulay-Lewis 2011**
Elizabeth Maucaulay-Lewis. "The City in Motion." In *Rome, Ostia, Pompeii: Movement and Space*. Ed. by R. Laurence and D. Newsome. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011, 262–289.
- Monteix 2010**
Nicolas Monteix. "L'insula orientalis II d'Herculaneum entre construction publique et transformations privées." In *Arqueología de la construcción II: Los procesos constructivos en el mundo romano. Italia y provincias orientales*. Ed. by S. Camporeale, H. Dessalles, and A. Pizzo. Congreso, Certosa di Pontignano, Siena, 13–15 de noviembre de 2008. Madrid: Instituto de Arqueología de Mérida, 2010, 213–232.
- Morretti 1996**
Jean-Charles Morretti. "Le gymnase de Délos." *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 120 (1996), 617–638.
- Morretti 1997**
Jean-Charles Morretti. "Les inventaires du gymnase de Délos." *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 121 (1997), 125–152.
- Müller and Kockel 2011**
Klaus Müller and Valentin Kockel. *Die Ehrenbögen in Pompeii*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2011.
- Neudecker 1988**
Richard Neudecker. *Die Skulpturenausstattung römischer Villen in Italien*. Beiträge zur Erschließung hellenistischer und kaiserzeitlicher Skulptur und Architektur 9. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1988.
- Noy 2004**
David Noy. "Review of: Virgilio Catalano, Case Abitanti e Culti de Ercolano, nuova edizione con gli Indici a cura di Laurentino García y García e Giovanni Panzera. Rome: Bardi, 2002." *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* (Feb. 22, 2004). URL: <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2004/2004-02-22.html> (visited on 19/11/2018).
- Pagano 1996**
Mario Pagano. "La nuova pianta della città e di alcuni edifici pubblici di Ercolano." *Cronache ercolanesi. Bollettino del Centro internazionale per lo studio dei papiri ercolanesi* 26 (1996), 229–262.
- Pagano 2000**
Mario Pagano. *Gli antichi ercolanesi: antropologia, società, economia*. Naples: Electa, 2000.
- Pappalardo 2005**
Umberto Pappalardo. "Hercules in Herculaneum. Ein Heros und seine Stadt." In *Verschüttet vom Vesuv. Die letzten Stunden von Herculaneum*. Ed. by J. Mühlenbrock and D. Richter. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2005, 69–80.
- Pearson 2015**
Stephanie Pearson. *Egyptian Ais: the Life of Luxury in Roman Wall Paintings*. PhD thesis. Berkeley, CA: University of California, 2015.
- Pedrucci 2009**
Giulia Pedrucci. *Cibele Frigis e la Sicilia. I santuari rupestri nel culto della dea*. Studia archaeologia 168. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2009.
- Pesando 2000**
Fabrizio Pesando. "Edifici pubblici antichi nella Pompei augusta. Il caso della Palestra sannitica." *Römische Mitteilungen* 107 (2000), 155–175.
- Pesando and Guidobaldi 2006**
Fabrizio Pesando and Maria P. Guidobaldi. *Pompeii. Oplontis. Ercolano. Stabiae*. Rome and Bari: Laterza, 2006.
- Ruck 2007**
Brigitte Ruck. *Die Grossen dieser Welt. Kolossalporträts im antiken Rom*. Archäologie und Geschichte 11. Heidelberg: Archäologie und Geschichte, 2007.
- Ruggiero 1885**
Michele Ruggiero. *Storia degli scavi di Ercolano. Ricomposta su documenti superstiti da M. Ruggiero*. Naples: Tipografia dell'Accademia reale delle scienze, 1885.

Rumscheid 2006

Frank Rumscheid. *Die figürlichen Terrakotten von Priene: Fundkontext, Ikonographie und Funktion in Wohnhäusern und Heiligtümern im Licht antiker Parallelbefunde*. Archäologische Forschungen 22. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2006.

Schäfer, Schmidt, and Osanna 2015

T. Schäfer, K. Schmidt, and M. Osanna, eds. *Cossyra I. Die Ergebnisse der Grabungen auf der Akropolis von Pantelleria. S. Teresa: Der Sakralbereich*. Tübinger Archäologische Forschung 10. Rahden/Westf.: Marie Leidorf, 2015.

Schwarzer 1995

Holger Schwarzer. "Statue eines Speerträgers (Doryphoros)". In *Standorte. Kontexte und Funktion antiker Skulptur*. Ed. by K. Stemmer. Ausstellung in der Abguss-Sammlung Antiker Plastik Berlin, 29.11.1994–4.6.1995. Berlin: Freunde & Förderer der Abguss-Sammlung Antiker Plastik, 1995, 432–433.

Spalthoff 2010

Benjamin H. Spalthoff. *Repräsentationsformen des römischen Ritterstandes*. Rahden/Westf.: Marie Leidorf, 2010.

Themelis 1998–1999

Petros G. Themelis. "Die Statuenfunde aus dem Gymnasion von Messene". *Nürnberger Blätter zur Archäologie. Publikationsreihe des Bildungszentrums der Stadt Nürnberg, Fachbereich Archäologie* 15 (1998–1999), 59–84.

Tran Tam Tinh 1971

Vincent Tran Tam Tinh. *Le culte des divinités orientales à Herculanum*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Tricarico 2013

Luigi Tricarico. "La Palestra Sannitica: rilievo e analisi tecnica delle strutture". In *Pompei/Messene: il Doriforo e il suo contesto*. Ed. by V. Franciosi and P. Thémelis. Naples: Università degli Studi Suor Orsola Benincasa, 2013, 49–64.

Tronchin 2006

Francesca C. Tronchin. *An Eclectic Locus Artis: the Casa di Octavius Quartio at Pompeii*. PhD thesis. Boston University, 2006.

Tronchin 2011

Francesca C. Tronchin. "The Sculpture of the Casa di Octavius Quartio in Pompeii". In *Pompeii: Art, Industry and Infrastructure*. Ed. by E. Poehler, M. Flohr, and K. Cole. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2011, 24–40.

Trümper 2008

Monika Trümper. *Die 'Agora des Italiens' in Delos: Baugeschichte, Architektur, Ausstattung und Funktion einer spätbellenistischen Porticus-Anlage*. Rahden/Westf.: Leidorf, 2008.

Trümper 2009

Monika Trümper. *Graeco-Roman slave markets. Fact or fiction?* Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2009.

Trümper 2017

Monika Trümper. "Greek Swimming Pools: Case-Study Olympia". In *Cura Aquarum in Greece. Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on the History of Water Management and Hydraulic Engineering in the Mediterranean Region: Athens, Greece, 28–30 March 2015*. Ed. by Kai Wellbrock. Schriften der Deutschen Wasserhistorischen Gesellschaft 28. Siegburg: DWhG Papierflieger Verlag GmbH, 2017, 215–250.

Trümper 2018

Monika Trümper. "Swimming Pools and Water Management in the Eastern Mediterranean World of the 4th to 1st Century BC". In *Water Management in Ancient Civilizations*. Ed. by J. Berkling. Berlin: Edition Topoi, 2018, 255–296. DOI: 10.17171/3-53.

Vetter 1953

Emil Vetter. *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1953.

Wallace-Hadrill 2008

Andrew Wallace-Hadrill. *Rome's Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Weinstock 1997

Holger Weinstock. "Zur Statuenbasis in der samnitischen Palästra von Pompeji". *Römische Mitteilungen* 112 (1997), 519–526.

Yegül 1993

Fikret K. Yegül. "The Palaestra at Herculaneum as New Architectural Type". In *Eius virtutis studiosi: Classical and Postclassical Studies in Memory of Frank Edward Brown (1908–1988)*. Ed. by R. T. Scott and R. A. Scott. Washington DC: National Gallery of Art, 1993, 369–393.

Zanker 1974

Paul Zanker. *Klassizistische Statuen: Studien zur Veränderung des Kunstgeschmacks in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1974.

Zanker 1979

Paul Zanker. "Zur Funktion und Bedeutung griechischer Skulptur in der Römerzeit". In *Le Classicisme à Rome aux Premiers Siècles avant après J.-C. Conférence 21–26 Aout 1978*. Ed. by Hellmut Flashar. Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique 25. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1979, 283–306.

Zanker 1995

Paul Zanker. *Pompeii. Stadtbild und Wohngeschmack*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1995.

Illustration and plate credits

ILLUSTRATIONS: 1 Nachlass Hoffmann, D-DAI-ROM-31.2451. 2 D. Esposito. 3 C. Anger, D-DAI-ROM-89.150. 4 DAI, D-DAI-ROM-227a. 5 Parco Archeologico di Ercolano-Catalogo Reperti-Foto n. 76901-1623/1. 6 Parco Archeologico di Ercolano-Catalogo Reperti-Foto n. 76901-1623/2.

PLATES: 1 M. Trümper after Pesando 2000, 164 fig. 5. 2 Tricarico 2013, pl. II. 3 Maiuri 1939, pl. IX. 4 Maiuri 1958, 114 fig. 91. 5 R. Henzel after Maiuri 1958, 114 fig. 91 and Borlenghi 2011, 199 fig. 90.

REBECCA HENZEL

M. A., Classical Archaeology (Berlin 2014), is a doctoral student at the Excellence Cluster Topoi and a member of the Berlin Graduate School of Ancient Studies. She is completing her dissertation on the statuary decoration of public spaces in Sicily from Hellenism to Late Antiquity. She studied in Würzburg, Berlin, and Rome and during her doctoral study was an Academic Visitor at the Faculty of Classics, Oxford and an Associate Member of Merton College, Oxford.

Rebecca J. Henzel, M.A.
Freie Universität Berlin
Institut für Klassische Archäologie
Fabeckstr. 23–25
14195 Berlin, Germany
E-Mail: rebecca.henzel@fu-berlin.de

MONIKA TRÜMPER

Dr. phil. (Munich 1995), Habilitation (Heidelberg 2005), is a Professor of Classical Archaeology at the Freie Universität Berlin and Spokesperson of the Berlin Graduate School of Ancient Studies for the FU. Her research focuses on Hellenistic and Roman architecture and urban studies, particularly domestic architecture, bathing culture, agorai/porticoes, and commercial architecture. She did fieldwork in Delos and currently has excavation projects in Morgantina and Pompeii.

Prof. Dr. Monika Trümper
Freie Universität Berlin
Institut für Klassische Archäologie
Fabeckstr. 23–25
14195 Berlin, Germany
E-Mail: monika.truemper@fu-berlin.de

Burkhard Emme

The Emergence and Significance of the Palaestra Type in Greek Architecture

Summary

This paper explores the significance of palaestrae as a characteristic architectural feature of Greek gymnasia. First, the identification of palaestrae from the archaeological evidence is examined. While gymnasia were identified based on the existence of a peristyle courtyard alone in earlier research, I argue that only the combination of peristyle, exedra and loutron is sufficient evidence for the secure identification of a building as a palaestra. Second, the interrelation of gymnasia and general developments of Greek architecture and urban design are discussed. Since gymnasia were a vital part of urban landscapes from the 4th century BC onwards, the architectural shape of palaestrae is closely related to contemporaneous concepts of diversification of urban space, and social exclusiveness.

Keywords: gymnasia; palaestra; Greek architecture; loutron; exedra; peristyle

Seit ihrem Aufkommen im 4. Jh. v. Chr. bildeten Palästre die typische Bauform griechischer Gymnasien. Der Beitrag diskutiert Funktion und Bedeutung dieser Architekturform aus zwei Perspektiven. Einerseits wird die Identifikation mehrerer Bauten kritisch hinterfragt (Argos, Epidauros, Milet, Paestum, Sikyon). Davon ausgehend wird die Kombination von Peristylhof, Exedra und Waschraum (Lutron) als ein Kriterienkatalog definiert, mit dessen Hilfe sich in aller Regel die typologische Deutung eines Baus als Palästra begründen lässt. Andererseits wird die Bedeutung des Peristylmotivs vor dem weiteren Hintergrund des zeitgenössischen Städtebaus erörtert. Dabei wird deutlich, dass das Peristyl auch im Fall der Gymnasia zur Schaffung funktional sowie sozial exklusiver Räume genutzt wurde.

Keywords: Gymnasion; Palästra; Griechische Architektur; Lutron; Exedra; Peristyl

The interrelation of gymnasia and Graeco-Roman cityscapes is reciprocal. On the one hand, the development of the institution of the Greek gymnasium took place within the framework of the Greek and Roman city, its physical shape and the political and religious institutions of the polis. On the other hand, gymnasia had an impact on the city as a whole. As architecturally defined spaces, gymnasia were part of the urban landscape from the 4th century BC onwards; as a vital place of interaction, the gymnasium usually formed a crucial part of the social life of the polis. Therefore, in order to arrive at a better understanding of the meaning of gymnasia and their architectural form it is inevitable to consider both, the architectural development of Greek cityscapes in general as well as that of Greek gymnasia in particular. Accordingly, the aim of this paper is twofold: in the first part, I will discuss palaestrae as the most typical architectural feature of Greek gymnasia. In the second part, I will focus on the significance of the peristyle as an architectural type in general.

1 Peristyles and (false) Palaestrae

In terms of architecture, probably the most characteristic feature of many Greek gymnasia was the palaestra. It is commonly accepted that Greek gymnasia usually comprised a number of separate architectural structures. This was the case in Amphipolis, Olympia, Priene, and many other places (Pl. 1). Typical buildings that could be part of a gymnasial compound include facilities for running like xystoi and stadia as well as bathing facilities and sanctuaries.¹ The presence or absence of all these structures within an architectural ensemble seems to differ according to local conditions. However, nearly all gymnasia had a peristyle building that is referred to typologically as palaestra.² With regard to their function, palaestrae can be considered the focal unit of each gymnasium. It is usually within the palaestrae where the majority of imagery was set up, where prestigious donations of specific parts of the architecture can be observed, etc. In the

terms of Greek epigraphy, one might say that the palaestra usually was the epiphanestatos topos of each gymnasium. In addition, the obvious importance of the palaestrae buildings is further emphasized by the chronological development of many gymnasia. As Christian Wacker pointed out in his study of the palaestra at Olympia, palaestra buildings were usually the earliest architectural structures that were constructed within a gymnasial ensemble.³ The apparent ubiquity of this building type regularly led scholars to the assumption that, in turn, a building with a peristyle is often likely to be a gymnasium.

The reason for this equation lies in the history of modern archaeology and in the excavation of Olympia in particular. It was as early as 1876 that excavations under the auspices of the German archaeological institute led to the rediscovery of a building that was immediately identified as the palaestra mentioned by Pausanias.⁴ Furthermore, the palaestra at Olympia was considered to be in accordance with the description of the ideal Greek gymnasium by Vitruvius.⁵ Due to its correspondence with these literary sources, the palaestra at Olympia soon became an important model for the interpretation of other peristyle buildings and was regularly referred to as such. Therefore, the impact of the palaestra at Olympia on the interpretation of allegedly similar buildings especially in the late 19th and early 20th century can hardly be underestimated. This is easily illustrated by looking at a number of comparable structures at other sites, that have originally, though wrongly, been identified as gymnasia mostly with explicit reference to the building in Olympia (Pl. 2).

For instance a major building in the sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidauros was identified as a gymnasium by its excavator Panagiotis Kavvadias in 1900 (Pl. 2).⁶ However, further research conducted by August Frickenhaus and successively by Richard Tomlinson proved that this building served as a dining establishment due to the installation of klinai within the major rooms.⁷ Similarly, a building in the extraurban sanctuary of Hera near Argos was considered a gymnasium by the excavators due to

1 For these components see Delorme 1960, 253–260; Wacker 1996, 61–66.

2 For the term *palaestra* see Delorme 1960, 260–271.

3 Wacker 1996, 61–66.

4 Paus. 6.21.2; Adler, Borrmann, and Dörpfeld 1892, 113–121.

5 Vitr. 5.11.1.

6 Kavvadias 1901, 143–154; Kavvadias 1901, 48–51: συμφωνεῖ τὸ οἰκοδόμημα τῇ τοῦ Βιτρούβιου περιγραφῇ, [...] συμφωνεῖ πλεονέκτον καὶ τοῦ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ ἀποκαλυφθέντος μικροῦ Γυμνασίου ἢ παλαίστρα.

7 Frickenhaus 1917, 131–133; Tomlinson 1969, 106–117; Tomlinson 1983, 78–84; Leypold 2008, 60–68.

the existence of a peristyle courtyard.⁸ It was once again Frickenhaus who could prove that the building was used as a setting for symposia due to the evidence of klinai in the three rooms that open onto the peristyle courtyard.⁹ Similarly, a building at Miletus has been identified as a 'Hellenistic Gymnasium' by its excavator Theodor Wiegand.¹⁰ This interpretation was based mainly on the alleged similarity to the lower gymnasium at Priene that had been excavated about 10 years earlier by Wiegand, as well.¹¹ In addition, the excavators considered the adjacent *thermae* of Capito a later addition to the original gymnasia structure.¹² However, whereas the secondary addition of bathing facilities to pre-existing gymnasia is generally a common phenomenon in Asia minor in the Roman Imperial era, this rule does not apply to the case of Miletus. In this case, no attempt was made to connect the *thermae* by adding a door to the northern back wall of the Hellenistic building (Pl. 3).

Since washing facilities have not been safely identified in the original structure, it seems very unlikely that this building functioned as a gymnasium at any point of its history. Due to its position at the center of the city as well as its spatial and chronological relationship to the neighboring bouleuterion the alleged Hellenistic gymnasium of Miletus might have housed a political or administrative institution of the city, instead.¹³ Yet another example is the case of the gymnasium at Sikyon. This building was originally identified as a gymnasium by its excavator Anastasios K. Orlandos with reference to its ground plan as well as a passage in Pausanias who mentions a gymnasium 'not far from the Agora'.¹⁴ The building was referred to accordingly until recently.¹⁵ However, a recent reassessment of the archaeological material found in the course of the excavations showed that this interpretation is rather unlikely.¹⁶ Further buildings that have been identified as gymnasia due to the existence of

a central courtyard include a building in Ai Khanoum as well as the so-called 'Asclepieion' at Paestum.¹⁷ Whereas the identification of the first building has been challenged by Inge Nielsen, who interpreted it as part of the extensive palatial quarters of Ai Khanoum,¹⁸ the example in Paestum is likely to be another example of a lavish dining hall from the early Hellenistic period.¹⁹

These examples illustrate that the general assumption that a building with a peristyle court must be interpreted as a gymnasium became something like a self-fulfilling prophecy within the archaeology of the early 20th century. Contrarily, the problem of the identification of palaestrae shows that the most conspicuous feature of this building type, i.e. the peristyle, was used for structures with a variety of other functions, as well. This observation leads to two implications. 1.) Since a peristyle courtyard alone is not sufficient evidence for the identification of a palaestra or gymnasium, more specific criteria need to be defined in order to securely identify these buildings from the archaeological evidence. 2.) Since the peristyle as an architectural feature is not restricted to gymnasia, the significance of this architectural type must lie beyond the concrete function of the individual building. Therefore, in order to arrive at a proper understanding of the phenomenon of Greek palaestrae it is inevitable to consider some general developments of Greek architecture and urban planning, especially of the 4th century BC when the peristyle became a widespread phenomenon in Greek cities and sanctuaries.

2 Peristyles and (genuine) Palaestrae

The problem of identifying gymnasia or, more precisely, palaestrae from the archaeological record is closely re-

8 Waldstein 1902, 132: "The original destination of the building is uncertain and conjecture has made it a gymnasium".

9 Frickenhaus 1917, 121–130; Leypold 2008, 28–33.

10 Wiegand 1908, 9–10; Gerkan and Krischen 1928, 1–22; Delorme 1960, 130–131.

11 Miletus: Wiegand 1908, 9. In his brief discussion of the functions of the individual rooms in the gymnasium of Priene Wiegand explicitly refers to Vitruvius as well as to the gymnasia at Delphi and Eretria. The palaestra at Olympia, however, is not mentioned: Wiegand and Schrader 1904, 274–275.

12 Wiegand 1908, 10.

13 For detailed discussion of the building see Emme 2013, 113–118; Trümper 2015 196–203.

14 Paus. 2.10.1–7; Orlandos 1934, 122; Wacker 1996, 220–221.

15 See e.g. Delorme 1960, 101–102; von Hesberg 1995; Wacker 1996, 219–223; von den Hoff 2009, 251; Emme 2013, 133–134.

16 Kazakidi 2012, 209–211; Lolos 2015, 64–74.

17 Ai Khanoum: Veuve 1987; von Hesberg 1995, 15–16; Paestum: recent works on the building were published by E. Greco, suggesting that the building housed a sanctuary of Asclepius: Greco 1999; for the interpretation as a gymnasium see Maiuri, Aurigemma, and Spinazzola 1986, 56; Lauter 1986, 237.

18 Nielsen 1994, 127.

19 For a discussion of the function of the 'Asclepieion' of Paestum see Emme 2016, 45–57.

lated to the problem of the function of these buildings. With regard to the ubiquity of palaestrae within Greek gymnasia it seems striking that the precise function of these buildings is far from being understood completely. Whereas the archaeological evidence of the use of individual rooms is often scarce, literary sources evoke the impression of a variety of different rooms for specific functions such as apodyteria, konisteria, sphairistrai, korykeia etc. However, discussions of these terms among both epigraphists and archaeologists have made it clear that many of them cannot be identified within the archaeological or architectural evidence from any site.²⁰ A promising example is the gymnasium at Delos. In this case, a rather precise description of the building survives in the form of several inventories from the mid-2nd century BC. The most famous among these lists, the so-called inventory of Kallistratos, can be dated to the year 156/155 BC.²¹ The inventory mentions the names of several rooms of the Delian gymnasium such as an apodyterion, a portico (peristoon), an exedrion, a loutron and an epistasion. These names have been attributed to different parts of the building by different scholars.²² The most likely solution is shown here in Pl. 4.

However, it is crucial to point out that only three parts of the building can be identified with certainty, according to their architectural shape. Obviously, the term peristoon refers to the portico, surrounding the central courtyard. The loutron can be identified with two rooms in the north-western corner of the building.²³ Finally, the term exedrion is likely to refer to the room on the northern side of the building regarding its architectural layout and the bench along its rear wall. The identification of the other rooms mentioned in the inscription relies mainly on the assumption that their order in the inventory reflects the progression of the magistrates on their way through the building.

Thus, the case of the Delian gymnasium illustrates that only three components can be identified with certainty from the archaeological evidence alone: beside the

peristyle itself, this includes washing facilities (loutra) and exedrae. Whereas a loutron will usually be discernible due to water installations such as basins, pipes, a water-proof floor etc., the main features of an exedra include a broad opening in the form of a colonnade and benches alongside the three remaining walls of the room. Rooms of this kind are found in almost all palaestra buildings where they served as places for lectures, philosophical discussions or similar gatherings. On the contrary, the precise architectural form of other rooms that are usually mentioned in the literary sources such as koinisteria, apodyteria etc. remains unclear. Therefore, it seems reasonable to accept the combination of the above-mentioned three features for the identification of palaestra buildings from the archaeological evidence. The validity of this approach can easily be tested regarding palaestrae of the 4th and early 3rd century BC that have been identified with certainty (Pl. 5).

Following the works of Jean Delorme, Henner von Hesberg and Christian Wacker, it is commonly accepted that there is hardly any archaeological evidence for Greek gymnasia before the early 4th century BC. Early examples include the gymnasia at Eretria, Amphipolis, and Delphi.²⁴ The Academy and the Lykeion of Athens might be two more candidates, but the current state of publication is too difficult to assess the precise date of these structures and their original layout in any detail.²⁵ As far as I can see, none of these buildings can be dated securely to the first half of the 4th century BC. To this group I would further add the palaestra at Olympia that is usually dated to the early 3rd century BC.²⁶ In the case of the gymnasium at Delos, a secure date based on archaeological criteria has not yet been established. The building or a predecessor on the same site might very well belong to the later 4th or early 3rd century BC, as well.²⁷ Finally, the gymnasium at Samos was presumably constructed at some point in the early 3rd century BC as well, but its design is not well known.²⁸

Among the buildings mentioned, the gymnasium at

20 For a detailed discussion of these terms see Delorme 1960, 272–336.

21 I. Délos Nr. 1417.

22 Audiat 1930; Audiat 1970; Roux 1980; Salviat 1994; Ferrutti 1998–2000. In contrast, Moretti 1996, Moretti 1997 proposed that the gymnasium mentioned in the inventory should be identified with the *Palestre du lac*. However, this interpretation seems rather unlikely, regarding the fact that the function of this building is generally far from clear, see Emme 2013, 255–256.

23 Trümper 2008, 251–255.

24 Eretria: Mango 2003; G. Ackermann and K. Reber in this volume; Amphipolis: Lazaridis 1997; Delphi: Jannoray 1953.

25 Academy: Caruso 2013; A. Caruso in this volume; Lykeion: Lygouri-Tolia 2002.

26 Wacker 1996.

27 For a brief discussion of the problem see von den Hoff 2004, 376–377; Emme 2013, 255–256.

28 Martini 1993.

Amphipolis yields good evidence for the functional conception of late-classical palaestrae. In its original state, the building was equipped with two *loutra* in the north-eastern and northwestern corner, respectively. A long room on the western side of the building has the form of an *exedra* with five columns of the front and a stone bench on the back wall. Another *exedra* might have existed in the eastern part of the building. Similarly, the western section of the gymnasium at Eretria comprised an *exedra* and an adjacent *loutron* in its northern aisle. Further research on the recently discovered eastern section of the building complex will clarify, in which way both parts were used with regard to their individual functions.²⁹ Given the state of preservation, the situation of the gymnasium at Delphi is less clear. Obviously, water installations were placed outside the palaestra proper in an open courtyard, including a circular pool and a series of basins along the western wall of the courtyard. A room for lectures or similar gatherings may be identified in the southern part of the palaestra, but the reconstruction of an *exedra* remains conjectural. Finally, the palaestra at Olympia combined two *loutra* in the northwestern and northeastern corners of the building with a total number of six *exedrae* of varying size. In sum, even though the total number of buildings is rather small, the archaeological evidence illustrates that the combination of *loutron*, *exedra* and a peristyle courtyard was something like a standard for palaestrae from the middle of the 4th century BC onwards.

While the existence of *loutra* and *exedrae* is closely related to the actual functions of these rooms within the gymnasial context, the reasons for the ubiquity of the peristyle itself are less obvious. The dating of the earliest examples of palaestrae to the middle of the 4th century BC indicates that the architectural scheme of the peristyle was not used for the construction of gymnasial architecture in the first place. In contrast, earlier examples of peristyle buildings clearly demonstrate that the architectural concept of a courtyard surrounded by porticoes was established already at the end of the 5th century BC

within Greek architecture.³⁰ This is illustrated mainly by the development of Greek dining facilities such as the Pompeion at Athens or a similar building in the Argive Heraion, mentioned above (Pl. 2).³¹ The scheme was then adopted for gymnasial architecture probably around the middle of the 4th century BC. Therefore, in order to arrive at a better understanding of the peristyle motif it is necessary to focus on some general developments of Greek architecture in the 4th century BC.

3 Peristyles and Urban Design

A good example from this period is the layout of Megalopolis in Arcadia (Pl. 6). The city was founded immediately after the defeat of Sparta in the battle of Leuktra in 371 BC. As recent fieldwork by Hans Lauter and Heide Lauter-Bufe has revealed the city center of Megalopolis was organized in an orthogonal shape. A central square can be identified as the *agora*. The place was surrounded by freestanding porticoes on all four sides, a conception that echoes the idea of the peristyle on a larger scale.³² In addition, two major building complexes were situated on the western side and in the southeastern corner of the *agora*. Whereas the first structure served to accommodate the political institutions of the city, the latter complex housed a sanctuary of Zeus.³³ The sanctuary consisted of a temple that was incorporated into the western portico of the complex. The secluded character of the building illustrates how the religious concept of the *temenos* was transferred into architecture.³⁴ The building complex on the western edge of the *agora* is yet more telling for the new conception of urban space in the first half of the 4th century (Pl. 6).³⁵ The extant remains show that the original complex consisted of four units: a spacious hall in the north, followed by three courtyard sections of different size and structure. According to the excavators, the complex originally housed a number of political and administrative institutions such as the *boule*, the *damiourgeion* as well as another sanctu-

29 See G. Ackermann and K. Reber in this volume.

30 Emme 2013, 294; while some earlier examples from the Archaic period may have existed, the type was widely adopted no earlier than in the late 5th century BC.

31 Pompeion: Hoepfner 1975; Argive Heraion: Emme 2011; Emme 2013; for an alternative dating of this structure to the late Archaic period see

Pfaff 2005, 576.

32 Sielhorst 2015, 23, 96–100; Dickenson 2017, 50–62.

33 For the complex on the western side of the *agora* see Lauter-Bufe and Lauter 2011; for the sanctuary of Zeus see Lauter-Bufe and Lauter 2009.

34 Emme 2013, 55–57.

35 Lauter-Bufe and Lauter 2011.

ary of Zeus and Hestia that would have been equivalent to a prytaneion in other cities.³⁶ Even though the identification of some of these institutions is hypothetical the general notion of defining different spaces for different functions by means of architectural segregation becomes obvious. Accordingly, the peristyle was used for a variety of different tasks, i.e. sacred and administrative functions in this case.

Another example is Miletus.³⁷ Here again, the architectural scheme of the peristyle was used for sacred as well as administrative buildings. In addition, a peristyle court was constructed as part of a market building on the southern side of the Lion Harbor at the end of the 4th century BC (Pl. 7). The complex consisted of a central square that was surrounded by rooms of equal size on all four sides as well as two outer porticoes on its northern and eastern sides. Due to its architectural shape and its position, the building is securely identified as a market.³⁸ The conception of the structure corresponds to a well-known passage in Aristotle's *Politeia* wherein the author claims that "there should also be a traders' agora, distinct and apart from the other [i.e. the political agora]."³⁹

The new conception of urban space that developed over the course of several decades between the later 5th and the early 4th century BC is interesting in several aspects: On the one hand, literary sources like Aristotle and Plato make it clear that the social and constitutional structure of the polis was supposed to find its physical equivalent in the city's layout and architectural shape. On the other hand, the conceptual differentiation of space was articulated architecturally by making use of a common architectural scheme, i.e. the portico in general and the peristyle, in particular. It is against this cultural and architectural background that Greek gymnasia were constructed from the 4th century BC onwards in the shape known to us. The impact of these ideas on the overall appearance of urban space is hard to envision, because of the poor condition of many of these buildings. The secluded character of peristyle architecture is best illustrated by reconstructions (Pl. 7). Interestingly,

from an architectural point of view it was not possible to tell whether a building like this was a bouleuterion, a sanctuary, a dining hall or a gymnasium, respectively.

Furthermore, the context of many buildings indicates that the architectural form of the peristyle often had a connotation of social exclusiveness. This is especially the case with regard to early examples such as dining facilities. In this case, Christina Leybold pointed out that lavish buildings like the Pompeion at Athens or the 'gymnasium' at Epidauros were used by members of a local or international elite⁴⁰. Similarly, the peristyle was a common feature within (proto-)hellenistic palaces like those of Vergina and Pella and became part of upper-class houses in the early 4th century BC, as well.⁴¹ It is not surprising, therefore, that the peristyle was adopted for gymnasial architecture. Literary and epigraphic sources clearly state that the gymnasium was a space exclusively frequented by male citizens of the polis and their sons. The social distinction that was inherent to the institution of the Greek gymnasium was marked architecturally by the adoption of a secluded building type.⁴²

In addition, the secluded character of peristyle architecture was further stressed by the construction of propyla.⁴³ Usually, propyla were built as secondary additions to the preceding structures like in case of the palaestrae in Amphipolis and Olympia, thus changing the outer appearance of these buildings. On the one hand, a lavish propylon would add significantly to the outer appearance of a building whose façades consisted mainly of blank walls. On the other hand, the monumental entrance would have transformed the act of entering a building into a special situation. However, the addition of propyla was not restricted to palaestrae but can be observed in combination with a variety of peristyle buildings. Therefore, like in case of the peristyle itself, the significance of propyla lies in their general connotation of exclusiveness and nobilitation.

Finally, with regard to the interrelation between the individual building and the surrounding cityscape, it is worth mentioning that the first buildings of the palaestra type can be observed at a time when the institution

36 For the interpretation of the individual parts of the building see Lauter-Bufe and Lauter 2011, 105–108.

37 Emme 2013, 265–270; Sielhorst 2015, 125–132.

38 Gerkan 1922, 20–23; Emme 2013, 159–162; Sielhorst 2015, 126–127.

39 Arist. *Pol.* 1331a–b; see also Plat. *Nom.* 778 c; compare Sielhorst 2015, 115; Dickenson 2017, 50–57.

40 Leybold 2008, 193–201.

41 Palaces: Nielsen 1994, 20–21, 81–99; houses: Walter-Karydi 1998.

42 Gauthier 1995; Kobes 2004; von den Hoff 2009, 245–246, 253–254; Emme 2013, 156–158.

43 von Hesberg 1995, 18–19; von den Hoff 2009, 254.

of the Greek gymnasium was transferred to places *intra muros*. It is generally accepted that this change in the placement of gymnasia happened sometime in the early 4th century BC.⁴⁴ This development is echoed in contemporaneous literary sources. For example, Aristotle demands that gymnasia for the *presbyteroi* should be situated near the agora, i.e. within the city.⁴⁵ Whereas the philosopher's claim reflects a theoretical ideal a contemporaneous passage from Aeneas Tacticus' book on *poliorcetics* illustrates that the placement of gymnasia *extra muros* was still the rule in the first half of the 4th century BC.⁴⁶ The author explicitly states that military commanders should not leave the city in case that an enemy set fire to buildings outside the walls like dockyards or gymnasia. Therefore, another reason for the adoption of the peristyle scheme for gymnasia architecture may have been the shifting of the institution to locations inside the city. It was in an urban surrounding, after all, where the application of secluding architecture was necessary in order to maintain the exclusive character of the social institution.

4 Conclusion

I tried to illustrate that architectural form and practical function are less interdependent than is usually thought. On the one hand, the Greek gymnasium would have fulfilled its basic function as a place of physical training and education very well without a peristyle courtyard. On the other hand, the architectural scheme of the peristyle was applied to a variety of functions other than gymnasia from the late 5th century BC onwards. This observation implies that the peristyle can hardly be reduced to a specific functional meaning. Its significance lies on a more general level: as a secluding architecture, the peri-

style made it possible to close off spaces for a variety of specific functions as well as individual social groups. It is obvious that both aspects apply extraordinarily well to the gymnasium. Finally, this interpretation is important for the understanding of the process of adaptation of peristyle architecture in the western Mediterranean as well. With regard to the variety of functions of peristyle buildings in the Greek east there is little reason to assume that every courtyard surrounded by columns was meant to evoke the impression of Greek gymnasia architecture or was even used accordingly.⁴⁷ On the contrary, the adoption of the architectural scheme in Italian architecture reflects a profound understanding of the general significance of the type: to organize urban spaces and to provide secluded units for specific functions and individual groups. This becomes most obvious with regard to the imperial *fora* in Rome. As Paul Zanker pointed out "the imperial fora were closed, self-contained areas. Each was strictly closed off from the next, even though they were adjacent to one another. [...] These separate spatial entities also constituted specific *pictorial spaces*."⁴⁸ It seems important to note the difference in the overall conception of these buildings. Whereas the gymnasia of the Greek polis were spaces of social interaction that were constantly shaped and re-shaped by the donation of individual parts and the construction of honorific monuments (Pl. 4) the imperial fora were clearly dominated by the individual person of the emperor including the iconography of statuary and decoration.⁴⁹ Therefore, it seems more likely that Italian buildings like the grande palestra in Pompeii were constructed on the conceptual model of the fora of Caesar and Augustus in Rome rather than on Hellenistic gymnasia. Thus, even though their architectural layout might be comparable, the function and social significance of these buildings could hardly have been more different.

44 von Hesberg 1995, 16; Wacker 2004, 149–152.


45 Arist. *Pol.* 7.11.1–3.

46 Aen. *Tact.* 23.6.


47 Dickmann 1999, 158.

48 Zanker 1997, 183.


49 Kyrieleis 1976; Zanker 1997; Emme 2013, 240.




Amphipolis, gymnasium. 4th century BC




Delphi, gymnasium. 4th century BC



Olympia, palaestra and gymnasium. 3rd/2nd century BC




Delos, gymnasium. 2nd century BC




Priene, Lower gymnasium. 2nd century BC

0 100 m


Pl. 1 Greek gymnasial compounds, 4th–2nd century BC.



Argos, Heraion
Hestiatorion, ca. 400 BC




Paestum, Asclepieion
ca. 300 BC




Miletus,
'Hellenistic gymnasium'
ca. 200 BC

0 25 m




Epidauros, 'Gymnasium'
ca. 300 BC




Sikyon, 'Gymnasium'
ca. 300 BC


Pl. 2 Alleged Greek gymnasia.




Pl. 3 Miletus, 'Hellenistic Gymnasium' and adjacent thermae. Note the non-existence of a door between both buildings as well as missing water installations in the northern aisle of the 'gymnasium'.




Pl. 4 Delos, gymnasium. Hypothetical reconstruction of room names according to the Delian inventories of the mid-2nd century BC (author).



Pl. 5 Greek Gymnasia. Exedrae marked red, loutra marked blue.



Pl. 6 Megalopolis, plan of city center at the end of the Hellenistic period.



Pl. 7 Miletus, reconstructed aerial view of city center at the end of the Hellenistic period.

Bibliography

Adler, Borrmann, and Dörpfeld 1892

Friedrich Adler, Richard Borrmann, and Wilhelm Dörpfeld. *Die Baudenkmäler von Olympia*. Olympia 2. Berlin: Asher, 1892.

Audiat 1930

Jean Audiat. "Le gymnase de Délos et l'inventaire de Kallistratos". *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 54 (1930), 95–130.

Audiat 1970

Jean Audiat. *Le gymnase*. Exploration archéologique de Délos 28. Paris: De Boccard, 1970.

Caruso 2013

Ada Caruso. *Akademia. Archeologia di una scuola filosofica ad Atene da Platone a Proclo (387 AC–485 DC)*. Studi di Archeologia e di Topografia di Atene e dell'Attica 6. Athens: Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2013.

Delorme 1960

Jean Delorme. *Gymnasion. Études sur les institutions consacrées à l'éducation en Grèce*. Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 196. Paris: Edition de Boccard, 1960.

Dickenson 2017

Christopher P. Dickenson. *On the Agora. The Evolution of a Public Space in Hellenistic and Roman Greece (c. 323 BC–267 AD)*. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Dickmann 1999

Jens-Arne Dickmann. *Domus frequentata. Anspruchsvolles Wohnen im pompejanischen Stadthaus*. Munich: F. Pfeil, 1999.

Emme 2011

Burkhard Emme. "Die Datierung des Bankettbaus im Heraion von Argos und die bauliche Entwicklung des Heiligtums". *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 126 (2011), 111–135.

Emme 2013

Burkhard Emme. *Peristyl und Polis. Entwicklung und Funktionen öffentlicher griechischer Hofanlagen*. URBS 1. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013.

Emme 2016

Burkhard Emme. "Das 'Asklepieion' von Poseidonia/Paestum und die frühhellenistische Bankettarchitektur". *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung* 122 (2016), 45–75.

Ferrutti 1998–2000

Francesco Ferrutti. "Il ginnasio di Delo e l'inventario di Callistrato". *Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle missioni italiane in Oriente* 76–78 (1998–2000), 219–234.

Frickenhaus 1917

August Frickenhaus. "Griechische Bankethäuser". *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 32 (1917), 114–133.

Gauthier 1995

Philipp Gauthier. "Notes sur le rôle du gymnase dans les cités hellénistiques". In *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus. Kolloquium München 24.–26. Juni 1993*. Ed. by M. Wörle and P. Zanker. *Vestigia* 47. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995, 1–10.

Gerkan and Krischen 1928

Armin von Gerkan and Fritz Krischen. *Thermen und Palaestren. Milet 1.9*. Berlin: Schoetz, 1928.

Gerkan 1922

Arnim von Gerkan. *Der Nordmarkt und der Hafen an der Löwenbucht, Milet 1.6*. Berlin and Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1922.

Greco 1999

Emmanuele Greco. "Il santuario sul lato sud-orientale: il culto di Asclepio ed i suoi predecessori". In *Forum ouest – sud – est. Poseidonia – Paestum 4*. Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1999, 54–61.

von Hesberg 1995

Henner von Hesberg. "Das griechische Gymnasion im 2. Jh. v. Chr.". In *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus*. Ed. by M. Wörle and P. Zanker. *Vestigia* 47. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995, 13–27.

Hoepfner 1975

Wolfram Hoepfner. *Das Pompeion und seine Nachfolgerbauten. Kerameikos 10*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1975.

von den Hoff 2004

Ralf von den Hoff. "Ornamenta γυμνασιώδη? Delos und Pergamon als Beispielfälle der Skulpturenausstattung hellenistischer Gymnasien". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasion. Symposium vom 27. bis 30. September 2001 an der Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe Universität in Frankfurt am Main*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004.

von den Hoff 2009

Ralf von den Hoff. *Stadtbilder im Hellenismus*. Ed. by Albrecht Matthaei and Martin Zimmermann. Berlin: Verlag Antike, 2009.

Jannoray 1953

Jean Jannoray. *Le gymnase*. Fouilles de Delphes. Topographie et architecture 2. Paris: De Boccard, 1953.

Kavvadias 1901

Panagiotis Kavvadias. "Περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ ἀνασκάφων. Τὸ γυμνάσιον". *Praktika* (1901), 48–51.

Kazakidi 2012

Natalia Kazakidi. "Ένα οικογενειακό σύνταγμα ανδριάντων της εποχής του Κλαυδίου και το γυμνάσιο στη Σικυώνα". In *Κλασική παράδοση και νεωτερικά στοιχεία στην πλαστική της ρωμαϊκής Ελλάδας*. Ed. by T. Stephanidou-Tiveriou and P. Karanastassi. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 2012, 193–211.

- Kobes 2004**
Jörn Kobes. "Teilnahme Klauseln beim Zugang zum Gymnasium". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasium. Symposium vom 27. bis 30. September 2001 an der Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe Universität in Frankfurt am Main*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 237–245.
- Kyrieleis 1976**
Helmut Kyrieleis. "Bemerkungen zur Vorgeschichte der Kaiserfora". In *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien. Kolloquium Göttingen 1974*. Ed. by P. Zanker. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976, 431–438.
- Lauter-Bufe and Lauter 2009**
Heide Lauter-Bufe and Hans Lauter. *Das Heiligtum des Zeus Soter in Megalopolis*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2009.
- Lauter-Bufe and Lauter 2011**
Heide Lauter-Bufe and Hans Lauter. *Die politischen Bauten von Megalopolis*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2011.
- Lauter 1986**
Hans Lauter. *Die Architektur des Hellenismus*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1986.
- Lazaridis 1997**
Dimitrios Lazaridis. *Amphipolis*. Athens: Archaeological Receipts Fund, Direction of Publications, 1997.
- Leybold 2008**
Christina Leybold. *Bankettgebäude in griechischen Heiligtümern*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2008.
- Lolos 2015**
Yannis Lolos. "L'architecture à Sicyone pendant la haute époque hellénistique". In *L'architecture monumentale grecque au III^e siècle a.C.* Ed. by J. de Courtils. Bordeaux: Ausonius, 2015, 52–82.
- Lygouri-Tolia 2002**
E. Lygouri-Tolia. *Excavating an Ancient Palaestra in Athens*. Ed. by Maria Stamatopoulou and Marina Yeroulanou. BARIntSer 1031. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2002.
- Maiuri, Aurigemma, and Spinazzola 1986**
Amadeo Maiuri, Salvatore Aurigemma, and Vittorio Spinazzola. *I primi scavi di Paestum*. Ed. by E. Greco. Salerno: Ente per le Antichità e i Monumenti della Provincia di Salerno, 1986.
- Mango 2003**
Elena Mango. *Das Gymnasium*. Eretria 13. Gollion: Infolio Éditions, 2003.
- Martini 1993**
Wolfram Martini. *Das Gymnasium von Samos*. Samos 17. Bonn: Habelt, 1993.
- Moretti 1996**
Jean-Charles Moretti. "Le gymnase de Délos". *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 120 (1996), 116–122.
- Moretti 1997**
Jean-Charles Moretti. "Les inventaires du gymnase de Délos". *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 121 (1997).
- Nielsen 1994**
Inge Nielsen. *Hellenistic Palaces. Tradition and Renewal*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1994.
- Orlandos 1934**
Anastasios K. Orlandos. "Ἀνασκαφή Σικυῶνος". *Praktika* (1934).
- Pfaff 2005**
Christopher Pfaff. "Capital C from the Argive Heraion". *Hesperia* (2005), 167–221.
- Roux 1980**
Georges Roux. "À propos des gymnases de Delphes et de Délos. Le site du Damatrimon de Delphes et le sens du mot sphairisteria". *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 104 (1980), 373–405.
- Salviat 1994**
Francois Salviat. "Au gymnase de Délos: La cour de balle et l'horloge". In *EYKPATA. Mélanges offerts à Claude Vatin*. Ed. by P. Villard. Aix-en-Provence: Université de Provence, 1994, 245–275.
- Sielhorst 2015**
Barbara Sielhorst. *Hellenistische Agorai. Gestaltung, Rezeption und Semantik eines urbanen Raumes*. URBS 3. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015.
- Tomlinson 1969**
Richard Tomlinson. "Two Buildings in Sanctuaries of Asclepius". *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* (1969), 106–117.
- Tomlinson 1983**
Richard Tomlinson. *Epidauros*. London and Toronto: Granada, 1983.
- Trümper 2008**
Monika Trümper. *Ausstattung und Funktion einer späthellenistischen Porticus-Anlage*. Internationale Archäologie 104. Rahden/Westf.: Marie Leidorf, 2008.
- Trümper 2015**
Monika Trümper. "Modernization and Change of Function of Hellenistic Gymnasia in the Imperial Period". In *Das kaiserzeitliche Gymnasium*. Ed. by P. Scholz and D. Wiegandt. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015, 127–149.
- Veuve 1987**
Serge Veuve. *Le gymnase*. Fouilles d'Aï Khanoum 6. Paris: De Boccard, 1987.
- Wacker 1996**
Christian Wacker. *Das Gymnasium in Olympia. Geschichte und Funktion*. Würzburg: Ergon-Verlag, 1996.
- Wacker 2004**
Christian Wacker. "Die bauhistorische Entwicklung der Gymnasien. Von der Parkanlage zum 'Idealgymnasium' des Vitruv". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasium. Symposium vom 27. bis 30. September 2001 an der Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe Universität in Frankfurt am Main*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 349–362.

Waldstein 1902

Carl Waldstein. *The Architecture of the Argive Heraeum*. The Argive Heraeum 1. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1902.

Walter-Karydi 1998

Elena Walter-Karydi. *The Greek House. The Rise of Noble Houses in Late Classical Times*. Athens: Archaeological Society of Athens, 1998.

Wiegand 1908

Theodor Wiegand. *Sechster vorläufiger Bericht über die von den Königlichen Museen in Milet und Didyma unternommenen Ausgrabungen*. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Berlin: Verlag der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1908.

Wiegand and Schrader 1904

Theodor Wiegand and Hans Schrader. *Priene. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen in den Jahren 1895–1998*. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1904.

Zanker 1997

Paul Zanker. "In Search of the Roman Viewer". In *The Interpretation of Architectural Sculpture in Greece and Rome*. Ed. by D. Buitron-Oliver. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1997, 179–191.

Plate credits

1–6 B. Emme. 7 Gerkan 1922, pl. 27.

BURKHARD EMME

Dr. phil. (Heidelberg 2010), is Assistant Professor at the Institute of Classical Archaeology of the Freie Universität Berlin. His research interests include Greek architecture and urbanism of the Classical and Hellenistic periods, with particular focus on peristyle buildings and cities in Asia Minor. Currently, he directs a fieldwork project in the Lower Agora of Pergamon.

Dr. Burkhard Emme
Freie Universität Berlin
Seminar für Klassische Archäologie
Fabeckstraße 23–25
D–14195 Berlin, Germany
E-Mail: burkhard.emme@fu-berlin.de

Guy Ackermann, Karl Reber

New Research on the Gymnasium of Eretria

Summary

The Gymnasium at Eretria is one of the best examples of a palaestra from the early Hellenistic period. This paper presents results from fieldwork carried out by the Swiss School of Archaeology in Greece in 2015 and 2016 that yielded important new insights for the chronology, plan, and function of this complex. The building was constructed around 330–320 BCE as a palaestra with two differently sized courtyards. The courtyards were probably conceived for use by different age groups. The construction period of the palaestra coincided with the introduction of the ephebeia in Eretria. The palaestra was remodeled several times, with a particular focus on improving its bathing facilities, and was finally abandoned around 100 CE when the ephebeia lost its importance.

Keywords: Eretria; gymnasium; palaestra; bathing facilities; ephebeia

Das Gymnasium von Eretria gilt als eines der besten Beispiele für frühhellenistische Palästren. Dieser Beitrag präsentiert die Ergebnisse neuer Forschungen, die die Schweizerische Archäologische Schule in Griechenland 2015 und 2016 durchgeführt hat und die signifikante neue Erkenntnisse für die Chronologie, den Plan und die Funktion des Komplexes liefern. Der Bau wurde um 330–320 v. Chr. als Palästra mit zwei verschieden großen Höfen errichtet, die vermutlich für unterschiedliche Altersgruppen konzipiert waren. Die Bauzeit korreliert mit der Einführung der Ephebeia in Eretria. Nach verschiedenen Umbauten, die vor allem der Verbesserung der Badeanlagen dienten, wurde die Palästra um 100 n. Chr. aufgelassen, als auch die Ephebeia an Bedeutung verlor.

Keywords: Eretria; Gymnasium; Palästra; Badeanlagen; Ephebie

1 Introduction

The Gymnasium of Eretria (Pl. 1) stands alongside the palaestrae of Olympia, Delphi, Delos, Miletus, Priene, and Pergamon as one of the most famous buildings of its kind in the ancient Greek world. Its architectural form is considered to be one of the best examples of an early Hellenistic palaestra and has been a frequent subject of commentary in research.¹ Recent studies, however, have shown that the plan of this gymnasium must be revised and that, as we will demonstrate in the following, such a process results in a significantly different picture of this building.

1.1 Research history of the Gymnasium of Eretria

The existence of a gymnasium in Eretria was attested as early as 1850, when a decree honoring a benefactor of the gymnasium was discovered.² In 1885, the Kleonikos statue came to light, a figure that is also known as the “Youth from Eretria” and is now preserved in the National Museum of Athens.³ Excavations at the gymnasium did not begin until 1895, however, under the guidance of R.B. Richardson, who was then the director of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens. While the results of this initial work were published only in preliminary reports,⁴ they were soon complemented by several more general studies on the ancient gymnasium, especially the work by J. Delorme published in 1960 and the 1972 entry by P. Auberson and K. Schefold in the guide to Eretria.⁵ The ruins were cleared of overgrowth over the course of two campaigns during this same period.⁶ Elena Mango then studied the gymnasium as part of her dissertation and carried out a series of investigations between 1993 and 1995 that were published in 2003 in Volume XIII of the series *Eretria, Ausgrabungen und Forschungen*.⁷

1.2 An unexpected discovery

A chance recent discovery, however, has revised our previous knowledge of the Gymnasium of Eretria. A large restoration program carried out by the Ephorate of Antiquities of Euboea under the direction of K. Boukaras provided an opportunity for the Swiss School of Archaeology in Greece (ESAG) to buy the two plots in the south and east of the gymnasium. A mechanical cleaning of these plots carried out between 2013 and 2014 by the Ephorate revealed not only the foundations of the southern part of the large courtyard A,⁸ but also the foundations and walls of a subsequent building in the east that also exhibits a peristyle courtyard (Pls. 1–2).

The excavations carried out by Mango to the east of the *loutron* B-C-D had already yielded evidence of the existence of a second building in the east of the palaestra, but the extent of her excavations had been greatly limited by the boundaries of the plot at the time. When the rooms K1, L, O, and P were partially revealed by Mango, they were interpreted to be part of a public bathing facility adjacent to the gymnasium.⁹ The archaeological investigations carried out by the ESAG in 2015, however, quickly confirmed that the eastern part constituted an architectural and functional unit in tandem with the western part: the Gymnasium of Eretria thus consisted of two adjoining building complexes, which together gave rise to the plan of a large palaestra with two courtyards (A and P). Instead of speaking of two palaestrae, plural, in the following, we prefer to describe the entire ensemble as one palaestra with two courtyards, which when taken together with the running track and other elements comprised the actual *gymnasium*.¹⁰

1 See Delorme 1960, 161–164; Zschietzschmann 1961, 62–63; Ginouvès 1962, 129–131; Glass 1968, 224–230; Auberson and Schefold 1972, 99–104; Wacker 1996, 209–210; Sapouna-Sakellari 1995, 37; Hoffmann 1999, 34, 124–125; Mango 2003; Gill 2004, 84–86; Ducrey et al. 2004, 198–199; Mango 2004; Winter 2006, 116 (geht nicht auf Mango 2003 ein); Emme 2013, 147–148, 329; Trombetti 2013, 116–127.

2 IG XII 9, 236.

3 On the statue see Fittschen 1995; Lehmann 2001; Mango 2010. On the relationship of the statue and the base (IG XII 9, 281), cf. Knoepfler 2009, 205, 239; N. Kasakidi in this volume.

4 Frothingham and Marquand 1895, 240–241, 417–420; Richardson 1896b;

Richardson 1896a; Heermance 1896.

5 Delorme 1960, 161–164; Auberson and Schefold 1972, 99–104.

6 Pétrakos 1961–1962 [1963]; Richardson 1896b; Schefold 1964, 105; Schefold 1966, works by Christiane Dunant.

7 Mango 2003. On the excavation campaigns cf. also Mango 1994; Mango 1995; Mango 1996.

8 Boukaras, Arndt, and Vouzara 2014.

9 Mango 2003, 46–48 und 128.

10 On the definition of the term “palaestra” cf. Delorme 1960, 253–271; Mango 2003, 18–20.

1.3 A new excavation and research program

This new discovery not only required a revision of the layout plan and the reconstruction of the Gymnasium of Eretria, but also a new excavation and research program begun in 2015 under the leadership of Karl Reber, Guy Ackermann, and Rocco Tettamanti. A total of three to four excavation campaigns were planned so as to expose the entire building and obtain material through targeted stratigraphic soundings in order to date the individual construction phases. The results will be presented in a new volume of the series *Eretria, Ausgrabungen und Forschungen* (Eretria, Excavations and Research) that should round out the volume already published by Mango.¹¹ In the following remarks, we will focus on four key questions: the construction period of the palaestra, the installations in the bathing rooms, the use of the various complexes, and the date the gymnasium was abandoned.

2 The construction period of the palaestra

The first question is how to date the two parts of the building, with their respective peristyle courtyards (courtyard A in the western part and courtyard P in the eastern part – Pl. 1): Was the palaestra planned from the beginning as an architectural unit with two courtyards, or was the eastern part built onto the older western part as a later expansion?

2.1 Remarks on the plan of the palaestra

At first glance, the overall plan of the palaestra suggests that the two different parts of the building were one unified design. The palaestra was constructed on the lower part of the southern slope of the Acropolis (Pl. 3) and forms a large, rectangular complex with a diagonal north façade that parallels an existing road that ran northwest-southeast (Pl. 1). The two parts of the building are con-

nected by a continuous wall (M47) to the south that served as a southern façade during the first construction phase. Not until a later phase of construction was the building expanded to the south, through the portico A3 in the western part and through rooms W-X-Y-Z in the eastern part.¹² The fact that the northeast corner of courtyard P (at K4 and T) is precisely aligned with the diagonal north façade seems to confirm the contemporaneity of the two parts of the building.

In addition, we can observe that individual rooms or room modules in the two parts of the building have the same dimensions. Courtyard P, for example, with its porticoes P1, P2, P3, and P4, is exactly the same size as the inner courtyard of peristyle A (without the porticoes A5 and A6, which belong to a later construction phase). The standardization of proportions and modules is also indicative that the two parts of the building were simultaneously conceived. Various depth soundings were carried out in the initial excavation campaigns in order to confirm this contemporaneity and narrow down the dating of the construction period.

2.2 Dating the first construction phase of the western part

Mango dated the construction period of the gymnasium to the very end of the fourth century BCE, or around 300 BCE.¹³ A new analysis of the material finds attributed to the first construction phase of the western part makes it possible to correct this dating upwards by almost a quarter of a century.¹⁴ The start of construction of the western part thus dates back to the transitional period from the Classical to the Hellenistic epoch, meaning from ca. 330–320 BCE or shortly thereafter.

In the 2015 and 2016 campaigns, a total of eight depth soundings were taken under the ground level of courtyard A in order to study the different phases of construction and gather enough material to date these phases (Pl. 1).¹⁵ The new dating to around 330–320 BCE is confirmed by the material found in these soundings.

11 On the excavation reports see Ackermann, Tettamanti, and Reber 2016; Ackermann, Tettamanti, Pradervand, et al. 2017.

12 Rooms U, V1, and V2 of the eastern part were likewise not added until the later Hellenistic period; cf. Ackermann, Tettamanti, Pradervand, et al. 2017.

13 Mango 2003, 49–55, 129, 133.

14 The four latest ceramic fragments, which according to Mango have a *terminus ante quem* of the very end of the fourth century, or around

300 BCE, have already been dated to the end of the classical period or the very beginning of the Hellenistic period, according to more recent research.

15 The different phases of the construction of the courtyard and its porticoes were reexamined: cf. Ackermann, Tettamanti, and Reber 2016, 86–89; Ackermann, Tettamanti, Pradervand, et al. 2017; but see Boukaras, Arndt, and Vouzara 2014, 135–140.

The soundings also showed that courtyard A, in its first phase, was bounded to the south by wall M47, and therefore was surrounded by only three porticoes (A1, A2, and A4) at that time. Not until a second construction phase, which can be dated to the beginning of the third century BCE, was courtyard A transformed into a veritable peristyle through the addition of the portico A3.

2.3 Dating the first construction phase of the eastern part

Mango suggested dating the initial construction phase of rooms K1, L, and O to the first half of the third century BCE.¹⁶ The walls of the exedrae O and S are constructed from large, polygonal blocks of limestone, the interstices of which were filled with smaller hewn stones (Pl. 2 and Fig. 2). This construction technique is characteristic of the architecture of Eretria in the fourth and early third century.¹⁷ Wall M47 from the first construction phase also continues on for a length of about 30m in the south of the eastern part, which, as already mentioned, is a main argument for the contemporaneous construction of the two parts of the building.

One piece of evidence is perplexing, however: the freshwater conduit of clay pipes (St98) discovered in the American excavations, which runs through a rock channel below the ground of K1, was cut through the north wall of exedra O and therefore must have been built even before the first construction phase (Pl. 1). As Mango had already suspected, this water line could have been connected to the rock channel observed to run below Room N and in the spout north of Room B.¹⁸ If so, the line would have been deliberately routed around the northeast corner of the western part (alongside room B). This would mean that there was a temporal hiatus between the construction of the western part and the creation of the northern rooms (L-O-R-S) of the eastern part. In fact,

the ceramic material from the soundings taken under the ground of courtyard P dates only to the early third century BCE (Pl. 2). We may therefore assume that the building was planned from the beginning with the two courtyards A and P, as the wall M47 confirms, but that the construction of courtyard P and the northern rooms of the eastern part did not start until a few decades after the western part had been erected.

2.4 The construction of the palaestra and the institution of the ephebeia in Eretria

The results from the first excavation campaigns have shown that the construction of the Gymnasium should be dated to nearly a generation earlier than previously assumed. The new dating around 330–320 BCE coincides with an important event for Eretria: this is the era in which the city introduced the Athenian-adopted institution of the ephebeia, perhaps as an indirect consequence of the *diagramma* of Polyperchon in 319/318 BCE that restored democracy in Eretria after an intermediate stage of oligarchical rule.¹⁹ *Epheboi* are mentioned for the first time in Eretria in a contract between Chairephanes and the city of Eretria, which dates chronologically to shortly after this event.²⁰ According to A.S. Chankowski, the introduction of this institution should not be dated before 340–330 BCE, since *epheboi* are not mentioned in the Artemisia Decree that was written in this era and governed the festivities to honor Artemis at Amarynthos.²¹ The introduction of the ephebeia by the Eretrians, which probably occurred around 319/318 BCE, was undoubtedly the precondition for building the gymnasium.

16 Mango 2003, 64–66.

17 It should be noted that the walls of the north wing of the building have no foundations of conglomerate blocks, since the limestone plinths rest directly on the natural rock.

18 Mango 2003, 71–72 (W1).

19 Chankowski 2010, 144–158, esp. 157–158; cf. also Chankowski 1993, first dating hypothesized between 340/330 and 319/318 BCE. On the consequences of the *diagramma* of Polyperchon for the city of Eretria cf. also Knoepfler 2001a, 183–184. Mango assumes that Chankowski sets the date of the introduction of the ephebeia in Eretria too high, especially

since she considers construction of the Gymnasium to have only occurred very late in the fourth century; Mango 2003, 133 note 794; cf. also Chankowski 2010, 468.

20 IG XII 9, 191, l. 44–47.

21 IG XII 9, 189. – On the dating of the decree IG XII 9, 191, cf. Knoepfler 2001b, 61–67. P. Fröhlich recently questioned the dating proposed by Chankowski by pointing out that the non-mention of *epheboi* in the Artemisia Decree of 340–330 BCE (IG XII 9, 189) is not a strong enough argument for a later introduction of the ephebeia; Fröhlich 2013, 524.



Fig. 1 Aerial view of the exedra Q1 in the western part of the gymnasium.



Fig. 2 Aerial view of the exedra O in the eastern part of the gymnasium.

3 The bathing rooms of the gymnasium

3.1 The exedrae Q1 and O

Excavation of the two bathing rooms Q1 in the west and O in the north wing of the eastern part was completed in 2015. Both rooms are closely comparable with each other in terms of architecture and interior installations (Figs. 1–2).²² Both are wide exedrae that are open to the porticoes in the corresponding courtyards (Q1 - A2 and O - P1). The stylobate evidence indicates that room O may be reconstructed as a distyle exedra *in antis*; the number of columns for exedra Q1, on the other hand, is not certain.

The floors of the two exedrae are decorated with mosaics. Q1 has alternating rectangular fields with white and black stone fragments (Fig. 1). The black field in the middle has a white palmette in the center, which is composed of marble fragments.²³ The floor in O consists of light-colored limestone fragments and a dark center image made out of gravel. The central ornament shows a rosette (Fig. 2). The polychromy and the use of fired clay shards for the middle rosette suggest a dating in the later Hellenistic period.²⁴

The exedra were surrounded on three sides by benches, but only the negatives of their supports are visible in the floor. These benches were interrupted in the middle of the back wall by a wide structure. The existing bases suggest that this was once a basin, similar in shape to that from the *loutron* B.²⁵ The water ran out through a drain into a series of smaller bases embedded in the

floor which, like those in room D of the *loutron*, were intended for washing feet. The basins in exedra Q1 were probably stolen at the end of the Hellenistic period or during the Roman Empire, along with the benches,²⁶ whereas five of the original eight basins for feet are still preserved in situ in exedra O. The floor slopes slightly to the southwest, where an open channel made of clay elements conducted the water under the stylobate and across the portico P1 into the courtyard P. The water intake in the two exedrae has not survived.²⁷

After their physical exercise, palaestra users could clean their bodies and feet with fresh, cold water in the various basins of the two exedrae. The installations in the two exedrae corresponded to those of the large *loutron* B-C-D, with its seven large basins and three basins for feet. The two exedrae differ from the *loutron* and the other Hellenistic baths by two important elements, however: first, marble benches run along the walls in the exedrae, similar to those found in the *apodyteria*, the changing rooms;²⁸ second, the exedrae are open to the courtyard, whereas the bathing rooms of the gymnasiums were usually designed so that they could not be seen from the outside. This type of bathing room, functionally located between the exedra locker room and the *loutron*, seems to be a unique architectural device.

3.2 A palaestra with four bathing rooms

Towards the end of the Hellenistic period, then, palaestra visitors had access to several baths of various kinds (Pl. 1): a series of three rooms with cold-water basins

22 Richardson reconstructed a broad staircase with three steps in Q1 in the west façade of the building and intended to identify the main entrance of the palaestra in it; Richardson 1896b, 158; cf. Mango 2003, 32. The exposure of this room in 2013 refuted this hypothesis; Boukaras, Arndt, and Vouzara 2014, 138–139. Room O had already been partially excavated by Mango and interpreted as the bathing facility attached to the gymnasium; cf. Mango 2003, 47–48, 128.

23 This mosaic can be dated to the late phase of the Hellenistic period, thanks to a fragment of an inscription built into the floor that bears the letter *alpha* in a script that is typical of the second century BCE (but see Boukaras, Arndt, and Vouzara 2014, 139). We thank Denis Knoepfler for this information. In terms of its technique, the mosaic floor can be classed between the pebble mosaics and the mosaics in *opus tessellatum*, without it being possible to narrow down the dating any further than between the third and second century; cf. Dunbabin 1979, 265–277; Salzmann 1982, 59–75.

24 On this fabrication technique cf. Dunbabin 1979. On the polychromy of late Hellenistic floors cf. Bruneau 1972, 83–86. On the survival of pebble

mosaics in the Hellenistic era cf. Bruneau 1969, esp. 318–321 in connection with room D.

25 Knoepfler suggested placing the basin in the northeast corner of room D. The basin had been donated by Kalliteles, son of Kallistratos, and Kallistratos, son of Kalliteles, toward the end of the second century BCE; cf. Knoepfler 2009, 213–219. But the basin could just as well have stood in the middle of exedra O or exedra Q1.

26 The holes created by the removal of the basins yielded ceramic material dating from the latter half of the second century BCE and the beginning of the first century BCE.

27 The water conduit found by E. Mango in the west wall of room O was not intended to supply water to the central basin; cf. Mango 2003, 48, 76–77.

28 On the multifunctional nature of the rooms of a palaestra, especially the exedrae, cf. Delorme 1960, 326–329; von den Hoff 2009.

29 Cf. Mango 2003, 38–41, 99–102, 122–123 (rooms B-C-D); 34–36, 91–97, 123–126 (rotunda G).

(*loutron* B-C-D), a *pyriaterion* for the sweat bath (rotunda G), and the two exedrae Q1 and O, which had their own cold-water basins as well.²⁹ These rooms were not sequential, as would be the case in a public bath, but distributed across the two different parts of the palaestra. The three bathing rooms of the western part are located in the north and west of the courtyard and each have their own respective entrances (the *loutron* B-C-D could be accessed through portico A1, the *pyriaterion* G through the large exedra F, and the exedra Q1 through the portico A2). As far as we know so far, however, the eastern part of the complex accessed only one bathing room (O), in its north wing. This eastern part could thus be used independently of the western part.

4 The palaestrae in Eretria

4.1 A palaestra with two courtyards

The originality of the Gymnasium of Eretria lies in the arrangement of the palaestra, with its two different peristyle courtyards (Pl. 1). As far as we know, there are only four other gymnasiums of ancient Greece that have a similar two-courtyard layout.

According to W. Hoepfner, the gymnasium of Rhodes should be reconstructed with two large palaestrae, one of which, according to an inscription found there, was reserved for the *epheboi*, the other for the *neoi*.³⁰ A third palaestra in the southeastern quarter of the city was then used by the *paides*.³¹

According to W. Martini, the gymnasium of Samos in the Hellenistic period was comprised of an east peristyle and a west peristyle, the “Ionic hall.” The latter, however, is the result of a reconstruction based on scant leads. In fact, only the architectural connection with the likewise hypothetically reconstructed *loutron* and the running tracks suggests a functional correlation with the gymnasium complex.³²

W. Hoepfner posits that the gymnasium of the Hellenistic period consisted of two palaestrae in Nysa, in the Meander River valley, one of which was used by the *epheboi*, and the other by the *neoi*.³³

During its second construction phase halfway through the second century BCE, the gymnasium of Aï Khanoum in Bactria took the form of a large palaestra without columns (courtyard 39) and a second courtyard in the south (courtyard 26) that directly accessed the first courtyard, which is why it was interpreted as a space for sporting activities.³⁴

The dimensions of the courtyards in these four gymnasiums are considerably larger in size than those in the palaestra of Eretria,³⁵ but probably were not always associated with additional rooms such as exedrae or baths. From an architectural point of view, these large courtyards were not as organically bound to a palaestra as those in Eretria; in addition, the two courtyards in Eretria likely did not perform the same function as has been reconstructed for those at Samos, Rhodes, Nysa, and Aï Khanoum: for example, the more modest dimensions of the courtyards of the Gymnasium of Eretria did not permit training in track and field athletics such as javelin or discus throwing.

In Eretria, the two parts of the building probably also served as military, sporting, and intellectual training facilities for various age groups, as W. Hoepfner has suggested of the gymnasium of Rhodes; we think of the *paides*, the *epheboi*, the *neoi* or *neaniskoi*, and *presbyteroi*. Both building parts included exedrae (F in the west, S and U in the east) for changes of clothing, and lessons probably also took place here. The two inner courtyards P and A were large enough for exercise in individual sports such as boxing, wrestling, and the long jump. The only differences were in the washing facilities: whereas the eastern part had only one bath (O), the western part featured three different baths (*loutron* B-C-D, Q1, and G). The only warm-water bath, however, *pyriaterion* G, was a later installation that did not come about until the

30 Hoepfner 2002, 69–70; on the reconstruction of the ensemble cf. figs. 87, 90.

31 This would be the Ptolemaion mentioned by Diodorus (XX, 100, 3–4). Filimonos 1989; Hoepfner 2002, 71–72 fig. 90.

32 Martini 1984, 26–36 (“east peristyle”) and 49–52 (“Ionic hall”).

33 Hoepfner 2002, 73–74 fig. 97.

34 Veuve 1987, 33 (courtyard 39); 103, 105 (courtyard 26).

35 Approximately 150 m on a side for the two peristyle courtyards of the gymnasium of Rhodes; cf. Hoepfner 2002, 69–70; approximately 78 m for the “Ionic hall” of Samos; cf. Martini 1984, fig. 36; 70 m for the two palaestrae of Nysa; cf. Hoepfner 2002, 73; 118.5 m to 96.5 m for courtyard 26 of the gymnasium of Aï Khanoum; cf. Veuve 1987, 103. For comparison, courtyard A of the Gymnasium of Eretria, together with the porticoes, is about 31 m on a side, and courtyard P approximately 21 m.

end of the Hellenistic period and therefore was not available to athletes at the beginning. The cold-water baths located in the two parts of the building were apparently sufficient in the early days of the gymnasium. The eastern and western parts could thus be used in parallel and independently of each other for athletic and intellectual training.

4.2 The southern palaestra

There is another building in Eretria designated as a palaestra that was located in the southeast of the city, near the interior port (Pl. 3). This building was excavated by K. Kourouniotis in 1917, who interpreted it as a small gymnasium or palaestra (Pl. 4).³⁶ His plan, however, with its square courtyard of 22.5m on a side (A) and three halls in the south (B), west (C), and north (D), does not reflect the otherwise usual four-sided peristyle that occurs in classical and Hellenistic palaestrae.³⁷ But the large room in the north (D), with its six interior columns and the four columns that partition its opening to the courtyard, can be compared to the exedrae in the gymnasiums.

P.G. Themelis doubted the reading of this building as a palaestra and suggested that it be interpreted as a sanctuary with a *hestiatorion*, comparable to the one in the Asklepieion of Epidaurus.³⁸ Themelis's arguments were later discussed by D. Knoepfler,³⁹ who for his part did not rule out the existence of a second palaestra in Eretria, especially since the large courtyard with the porticoes was thoroughly suited to athletic activities.⁴⁰

Knoepfler refuted the arguments by Themelis advocating the palaestra's use as sanctuary.⁴¹

Following its exposure by K. Kourouniotis in 1917, the southern palaestra was cleaned and redocumented by V. Petrakos around 1960.⁴² Since a more in-depth study of this building does not yet exist, at present we can only declare that various phases of construction occurred before it reached its final form, and we cannot specify the dating any further. The study by Auberson and Schefold on the technique used in the construction of the walls of the palaestra led to the assumption that the structure dates around 400 BCE.⁴³ This dating seems to us to be rather high compared to other buildings of this type. If we were to follow Auberson and Schefold's method of dating based solely on the construction technique of the walls, with their foundations of rectangular conglomerate blocks and polygonal limestone plinths, we could generally date the building to the fourth or early third century BCE. Because of the lack of dateable material, however, we cannot say whether the palaestra is older, younger, or contemporaneous with the gymnasium located at the foot of the Acropolis. In the summer of 2016, the ESAG collaborated with the Ephorate of Antiquities of Euboea to carry out a new clean-up of the ruins and draw up a more detailed layout of the floor plan.⁴⁴ There are also plans to use stratigraphic soundings to clarify the question of how to date the different phases of construction.

36 The building was subsequently referred to as the "Unteres Gymnasium" (Lower Gymnasium); Auberson and Schefold 1972, 145; see also Emme 2013, 330; as the "Gymnase du Bas (palestre)"; Knoepfler 1990, 125, 127; or as the "Lower Gymnasium – Palaestra"; Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1995, 45. Because of the lack of inscriptions that explicitly identify the building as part of a gymnasium, for example by mentioning *epheboi* or gymnasiarchs, we here prefer the term proposed in the 2004 guide to Eretria, "palestre sud" (southern palaestra); Ducrey et al. 2004, 260.

37 Kourouniotis 1917a; Kourouniotis 1917b. Descriptions of the preserved ruins are in Auberson and Schefold 1972, 145–148; Themelis 1987, 115–116; Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1995, 45; Ducrey et al. 2004, 260–261; Emme 2013, 330.

38 Themelis 1987, 117–118.

39 Knoepfler 1990, 122–123.

40 Auberson and Schefold have speculated that the rooms north of the two tholos baths in the Hellenistic bathing complex at the port were also used for physical exercise, arguing that bathing facilities of the Hellenis-

tic period were always associated with palaestrae.; Auberson and Schefold 1972, 129. We do not think that the surviving ruins support such an assumption, especially since the public baths of this period did not usually have additional palaestrae.

41 The bases found there for inscriptions could also have been used in a palaestra for inscriptions to honor the athletes or magistrates. The votive offerings that surfaced in the building may also have been dedicated to Hermes or Herakles, the gods of the gymnasium. The inscription *horos ierou*, which Themelis invoked as a major argument for the sanctuary interpretation, was used in a wall as spolia and seems to have come from another sanctuary nearby. As Knoepfler put it, "rien, en fin de compte, n'oblig[e] à renoncer à l'idée – très raisonnable – qu'il s'agit d'une palestre"; Knoepfler 1990, 123.

42 Petrakos 1961–1962 [1963].

43 Auberson and Schefold 1972, 146.

44 This work was carried out by G. Luisoni as part of a master's thesis at the University of Lausanne.

4.3 A palaestra for the *paides*?

The large room E in the northwest corner of the southern palaestra was interpreted as a sanctuary of the goddess Eileithyia (Pl. 4).⁴⁵ There was a base located across from the rear wall in this room, which served as either an altar or a support for statues.⁴⁶ The base of a stela stood in front of the western entrance. K. Kourouniotis writes that several terracotta figurines and fragments of a dedicatory inscription were found that very likely name the goddess Eileithyia as the recipient.⁴⁷ Knoepfler connected these finds mentioned by the excavator to the dedicatory inscription to Eileithyia assembled by B. Petrakos in the Museum of Eretria,⁴⁸ which has strengthened the assumed interpretation of room E as a sanctuary of this kourotrrophic goddess.⁴⁹

On the basis of this interpretation, Knoepfler ventured the hypothesis that the southern palaestra was where young boys (the *paides*) were educated,⁵⁰ especially since the goddess Eileithyia watches over not only childbirth and delivery, but also the stage of adolescence in a broader context. Furthermore, the cult dedicated to this deity is often associated with palaestrae, for example those in Megara (Paus. 1.44.2), Delos, and likely in Megalopolis (Paus. 8.32.4).⁵¹

According to Knoepfler, this proposal to interpret the southern palaestra as a site of education for the *paides* does not rule out that young boys were also being trained in the gymnasium at the foot of the Acropolis (Pl. 1). Two inscriptions would seem to confirm this: The decree in honor of the Elpinikos gymnasium mentions the employment of a *rhetor* and a *hoplomachos* in the gymnasium for the education “of the *paides*, the *epheboi*, and for all who would like to benefit from this offer.”

⁵² Another inscription, which was found in room I of the gymnasium, cites victory in the endurance run in the

boys’ category (*philoponias paidon*).⁵³ The *paides* of Eretria therefore had access both to the gymnasium at the foot of the Acropolis, at least during the late Hellenistic period, and to the southern palaestra, which was probably reserved for them alone.

4.4 A gymnasium for different age groups

Given what we know, there is nothing wrong with assuming that in the case of the gymnasium at the foot of the Acropolis, the building complex was used by various age groups: the *paides*, *epheboi*, *neoi* or *neaniskoi*, and *presbyteroi*. The two courtyards of the palaestra seem to confirm this assumption: as an example, the *epheboi* could be training in the western part while exercises with the *paides* would be taking place in the eastern part at the same time. But one could also imagine the two parts of the building being used at the same time for different activities by one age group. The various age groups could frequent the palaestra at different times, as is attested for example in the gymnasium of Veroia in Macedonia.⁵⁴ In any case, the presence of two different parts of the building, each with its own courtyard, had decisive advantages over a single-courtyard palaestra.

5 The abandonment of the gymnasium

The various excavations of the palaestra have so far provided few indications for dating the last phase of construction, or the point when the gymnasium was abandoned (Pl. 1).⁵⁵ The excavations that Richardson carried out in the western part of the building in the late nineteenth century were dug to ground level throughout the north wing (rooms B – J) and left no remains behind from the use or destruction layer. Only the statues, in-

45 Knoepfler 1990.

46 Cf. Themelis 1987, 116.

47 Kourouniotis 1917a, 239; Kourouniotis 1917b, 18; cf. Themelis 1987, 117.

48 IG XII suppl. 560 and 572.

49 Knoepfler 1990, 120. Cf. also J. and L. Robert, *Bull. Epigr.* 1969 in REG 82 (1969), notice 450, 496–497 (bezugnehmend auf die Entdeckung von Knoepfler). On the interpretation of the inscription IG XII Suppl. 560+572, cf. Knoepfler 1990, 117–120, with bibliography.

50 Knoepfler 1990, 122–124. This hypothesis was adopted by Aneziri and Damaskos 2004, 254–255 and Trombetti 2013, 120–121.

51 IG XI 2, 287 A84. – On the discussion about the written sources cf.

Knoepfler 1990, 23–24.

52 IG XII 9, 234, 1.9–12. Cf. Martin Pruvot, Reber, and Theurillat 2010, 186 no. 189, with bibliography.

53 IG XII 9, 282; cf. also D. Knoepfler, *Bull. Epigr.* 2006 in REG 119 (2006), notice 214, 664–665.

54 Cf. Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 72–74, 78.

55 We will not go into detail here on the hypothesis of a first destruction of the gymnasium in the early second century, which is thought to have taken place in conjunction with the conquest of Eretria by the Roman troops under L. Quinctius Flamininus in 198 BCE; cf. Mango 2003, 66.

scriptions, and a few architectural elements are known from these excavations. The soundings that Mango took were concentrated mainly on the lower levels beneath the ancient soil layers. The Ephorate's cleaning work in courtyard A of the eastern part has likewise yielded little useful material.⁵⁶ The situation looks a little better for the north wing of the eastern part, where we found parts of the destruction layer.

5.1 Dating the last use of the western part

According to Mango, the north wing of the western part was rebuilt in the first half of the first century BCE.⁵⁷ Her work confirms that the gymnasium was not abandoned following the Mithridatic War and the capture of the city by the Roman general Sulla in 86 BCE.⁵⁸ Several other indications also suggest that the gymnasium continued to be used after Sulla's conquest. The 29 inscriptions found in the gymnasium and presented by Mango and Knoepfler⁵⁹ include two dating to the Roman era, including a herm from the first or second century CE,⁶⁰ as well as the base of the statue of Kleonikos, the "Ephebe of Eretria," whose inscription Knoepfler attributes to the Augustan period.⁶¹ Mango dates six of the eight sculptures found in the western part to the early days of the Roman Empire, arguing that these confirm that this part of the palaestra continued to be used until at least the late first century BCE.⁶² We can add to this a marble antefix that Mango dated to the last third of the first century BCE.⁶³

Considering the sparse material that Mango found

in her soundings, the absence of coins from imperial Rome is especially astonishing.⁶⁴ Mango dates the abandonment of the gymnasium to the first half of the second century CE based on various glass fragments and two bronze fibulae from the rooms H, I, and J in the northwest of the building.⁶⁵ The three rim fragments of blown-glass cups are typical of the Flavian period, but circulated until the early second century CE, whereas the fibulae were probably made in the second half of the first century CE.⁶⁶ It thus would not contradict Mango's assumption if the rooms H, I, and J were abandoned in the second century AD, but the *terminus post quem* for this event seems to be in the Flavian period or the last third of the first century BCE. An overview of the material found between 1993 and 1995 reveals that no Roman pottery turned up, apart from a fragment of a lamp and some fragments of a trefoil jug found in the street to the north of the palaestra.⁶⁷ The scarcity of Roman ceramic material is undoubtedly explained by the thorough exposure of the northern wing during the excavations of the nineteenth century.

The inscriptions, sculptures, and sparse material from the destruction layers, then, suggest that the western wing was abandoned in the latter part of the first century CE, or no later than the early second century CE.

5.2 Dating the abandonment of the eastern part

Glass fragments and two other bronze fibulae found in the destruction layers of exedra O and portico P1 like-

56 The foundation walls of the porticoes were only about 0.2m below the modern surface; the uppermost layer of earth was also disturbed by later agricultural activities.

57 Mango 2003, 61–63: "third construction phase".

58 Knoepfler 2009, 235 with note 128; 235. It is impossible to say whether the gymnasium was damaged or destroyed in these events. Nor is it clear whether the renovations were carried out shortly after that date or later, at the beginning of the Roman Empire. On the conquest of Eretria by Sulla in spring 86 BCE cf. Schmid 2000, 176–179.

59 Mango 2003, 148–150; Knoepfler 2009; cf. also D. Knoepfler, *Bull. Epigr.* 2006 in REG 119 (2006), notice 214, 664–665.

60 IG XII 9, 253 = Mango 2003, 148 E8.

61 IG XII 9, 281 = Mango 2003, 149 E11. On the dating cf. Knoepfler 2009, 240.

62 These are the following fragments: 1) Fragment of ephebe likeness, found north of portico A2 and dated to the Tiberian-Claudian period; Mango 2003, 103–104 fig. 120, S1; 2) fragment of the face of an ephebe or herm

from portico A1, dated to the first century CE (Mango 2003, 104 fig. 121, S3); 3) herm head from room F, dated to the first or second century CE (Mango 2003, 104–106 fig. 122, S2); 4) male tondo likeness also from room F, dated to the late first or early second century CE (Mango 2003, 109–111 fig. 125–126, S5); 5) statue of the "Ephebe of Eretria" from the Augustan Age (Mango 2003, 111–115 fig. 127–129, S6); 6) tondo bust fragment, which was found in the *loutron* and can be dated to the first or second century CE (Mango 2003, 115–116 fig. 130–131, S4).

63 Mango 2003, 98, fig. 115, A13.

64 Cf. Mango 2003, 158; Spoerri Butcher 2011, 426.

65 Mango 2003, 66 fig. 77.

66 We are grateful to Brigitte Demierre Prikhodkine and Matthieu Demierre for this information. The parallels proposed by Mango do not *a priori* support a *terminus post quem* after the first century CE; cf. Mango 2003, 157, K44.2–4. 6–7.

67 Mango 2003, 23 fig. 10, K33.2.

68 Mango 2003, 66–67 fig. 77, K28.1–6.



Fig. 3 The *apodyterium* with mosaic and marble supports for a bench (right) and the *frigidarium* (left) in the Roman thermae of Eretria.

wise let Mango date the abandonment of the eastern part to the first half of the second century CE (Pl. 2).⁶⁸ One glass fragment belongs to the same category as the fragments from the blown-glass cups in the western wing and therefore probably also dates from between the Flavian period and the beginning of the second century CE. The fibulae, however, date back to the first half of the first century CE.

The excavations of the eastern part that we carried out over the last two years did not yield any material that can be dated so late. The material found in the destruction layers of this sector of the palaestra belongs exclusively to the period that falls between the end of the Hellenistic age and no later than the beginning of the Roman Empire. There are a few fragments of blown-glass vessels and a dozen ceramic fragments from the early decades of the first century CE. The lack of sufficiently dateable material does not allow us to isolate a more specific date when the eastern part was abandoned. It does seem, however, that this part of the building was vacated earlier than the western part.

The well that we cleared in room K3 has provided the latest material yet. A few ceramic fragments from the Roman Empire and a bronze coin from Chalcis with the image of Emperor Caracalla were found in its fill layer, which provides a *terminus post quem* in the late second century CE for the filling of the well.⁶⁹ A clear indication

that the palaestra had ceased operation by that time is the find of three fragments from a bronze statue of a young man or a youthful god; these had been disposed of in the well. Some late walls suggest that elements of the eastern part of the building were redesigned and reused after their original function was abandoned. One of these walls separated portico P1 from portico P4; another wall, installed between the columns and the eastern pilaster of exedra S, closed off the open access to the former exedra. The construction of these walls cannot be precisely dated, unfortunately, but the modification of the porticoes and of exedra S would suggest the installation of a modest home or stable that was built into the existing ruins after the palaestra had been abandoned.

5.3 The abandonment of the gymnasium and the decline of the ephebeia in Eretria

The Gymnasium of Eretria was still in operation at the beginning of the Roman Empire, as the sculptures and inscriptions confirm. But its operations seem to have ceased around the mid-second century CE. The reason for the abandonment of the gymnasium probably has to do with the decision to build a new thermae facility with hypocaust heating slightly further to the south (Pl. 3).⁷⁰ The *apodyterium* of this facility featured a marble bench running along the walls, with feet of sculpted lion's paws

⁶⁹ We are grateful to Marguerite Spoerri-Butcher for identifying this coin.

⁷⁰ On this bathing facility see Theurillat, Dubosson, and Duret 2010; Dubosson 2011; Theurillat, Dubosson, Ackermann, et al. 2011; Theurillat,

Ackermann, Duret, and Tettamanti 2012; Theurillat, Ackermann, Duret, Saggini, et al. 2013; Theurillat, Ackermann, Tettamanti, et al. 2014.

and griffin's claws (Fig. 3).

This bench is very likely to have originated from one of the exedrae in the gymnasium,⁷¹ where it would have been stolen no later than the mid-second century CE. The institution of the ephebeia in Eretria seems to have come to an end during the same period. The latest inscription that still mentions the ephebeia uses letters that date back to between the first and the second century CE.⁷²

6 Concluding remarks

In contrast to other Greek cities, where one can observe the integration of thermae facilities into the Hellenistic palaestras during the Roman period, the gymnasium of Eretria was not equipped with hot water baths in that era.⁷³ The users of the gymnasium in the imperial era still had to wash with cold water, but they had the opportunity to take a sweat bath in *pyriaterion* G.

Outside the gymnasium, however, several public bathing facilities were being built in the city during the Hellenistic period (Pl. 3). These were the tholos baths in

the mosaic house quarter, in the northeast of the Agora, and near the port, as well as a small bathing facility at the Acropolis.⁷⁴ These bathing facilities were not reserved only for the users of the gymnasium, but also met a general need among the entire Eretrian population for hygiene and comfort.

Two public bathing facilities have been excavated in recent years by the ESAG: a tholos bath, constructed about a hundred meters from the gymnasium toward the end of the first century BCE or the beginning of the first century CE;⁷⁵ and the Roman thermae complex that arose directly south of the gymnasium around the middle of the second century CE, replacing both the older tholos bath and the gymnasium (Fig. 3).⁷⁶ Accordingly, we find a good example in Eretria of the transition from a Hellenistic palaestra that was used for the athletic, military, and intellectual training of young men, in line with Greek tradition, to a Roman bathing facility that was more concerned with the necessities of hygiene and personal care. The thermae had only a small courtyard available for physical education, which hardly qualifies it as a palaestra in the Greek sense.⁷⁷

71 In the bathing rooms Q1 and O as well as in the exedrae S and U, only the bases or negatives of such bench supports were found, indicating that these were torn out after the gymnasium was abandoned, probably so that they could be reused elsewhere (in the Roman thermae).

72 IG XII 9, 253.

73 On the integration of baths with hypocaust systems and *tubuli* into the Hellenistic palaestrae during the imperial era cf. Trümper 2015; Yegül 1992, 21–24.


74 On these public bathing facilities cf. Katsali 2015; Thierry Theurillat, Guy Ackermann, and Simone Zurbriggen. "From Classical Loutron to Roman Thermae: The Romanization of Baths at Eretria?" In *What's New in*

Roman Greece? International Conference held at Athens (8–10 October 2015). Ed. by V. Di Napoli (forthcoming).

75 Cf. Ackermann, Tettamanti, and Zurbriggen 2015.

76 Cf. Theurillat, Dubosson, and Duret 2010; Dubosson 2011; Theurillat, Dubosson, Ackermann, et al. 2011; Theurillat, Ackermann, Duret, and Tettamanti 2012; Theurillat, Ackermann, Duret, Saggini, et al. 2013; Theurillat, Ackermann, Tettamanti, et al. 2014; Ackermann, Tettamanti, and Zurbriggen 2015.


77 This facility stands in contrast to the bath/gymnasium complexes of Asia Minor that attest to the continuity of athletic exercises in their large peristyle courtyards; cf. the examples in Miletus, Trümper 2015, 196–203.




Pl. 1 Schematic plan of the palaestra of the Gymnasium of Eretria.



Pl. 2 Aerial view of the eastern part of the palaestra after the excavations in the summer of 2016.



Pl. 3 Archaeological plan of the ancient city of Eretria indicating the palaestrae and public bathing facilities.



Pl. 4 Schematic plan of the southern palaestra.

Bibliography

Ackermann, Tettamanti, Pradervand, et al. 2017

Guy Ackermann, Rocco Tettamanti, Aude-Line Pradervand, and Karl Reber. "Le Gymnase d'Erétrie 2016". *Antike Kunst* 60 (2017), 126–134.

Ackermann, Tettamanti, and Reber 2016

Guy Ackermann, Rocco Tettamanti, and Karl Reber. "Le Gymnase d'Erétrie 2015". *Antike Kunst* 59 (2016), 85–94.

Ackermann, Tettamanti, and Zurbriggen 2015

Guy Ackermann, Rocco Tettamanti, and Simone Zurbriggen. "Les bains à tholos (Ier siècle av. J.-C. – Ier siècle apr. J.-C.)". *Antike Kunst* 58 (2015), 140–143.

Aneziri and Damaskos 2004

Sophia Aneziri and Dimitris Damaskos. "Städtische Kulte im hellenistischen Gymnasion". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004, 247–271.

Auberson and Schefold 1972

Paul Auberson and Karl Schefold. *Führer durch Eretria*. Bern: Francke-Verlag, 1972.

Boukaras, Arndt, and Vouzara 2014

Konstantinos Boukaras, Robert C. Arndt, and Garefalia Vouzara. "New Discoveries in the Gymnasion at Eretria". *Antike Kunst* 57 (2014), 134–141.

Bruneau 1969

Philippe Bruneau. "Prolongements de la technique des mosaïques de galets en Grèce". *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 93 (1969), 308–332.

Bruneau 1972

Philippe Bruneau. *Exploration archéologique de Délos XXIX: Les mosaïques*. Paris: De Boccard, 1972.

Chankowski 1993

Andrzej S. Chankowski. "Date et circonstance de l'institution de l'éphébie à Erétrie". *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 19.2 (1993), 17–44.

Chankowski 2010

Andrzej S. Chankowski. *L'éphébie hellénistique. Etude d'une institution civique dans les cités grecques des îles de la Mer Egée et de l'Asie Mineure*. Paris: De Boccard, 2010.

Delorme 1960

Jean Delorme. "Gymnasion. Etudes sur les monuments consacrés à l'éducation en Grèce". *Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome* 196 (1960).

Dubosson 2011

Benoît Dubosson. "Une mosaïque de galets romaine à Erétrie (Grèce, Eubée)". *Journal of Mosaic Research* 4 (2011), 5–16.

Ducrey et al. 2004

Pierre Ducrey, Sylvian Fachard, Denis Knoepfler, Thierry Theurillat, Delphine Wagner, and Angelos G. Zannis. *Erétrie. Guide de la cité antique*. Gollion: Infolio, 2004.

Dunbabin 1979

Katherine M. D. Dunbabin. "Technique and Materials of Hellenistic Mosaics". *American Journal of Archaeology* 83 (1979), 265–277.

Emme 2013

Burkhard Emme. *Peristyl und Polis. Entwicklung und Funktionen öffentlicher griechischer Hofanlagen*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2013.

Filimonos 1989

Melina Filimonos. "Ενα νέο γυμνάσιο στη Πόδο". *L'antiquité classique* 58 (1989), 128–156.

Fittschen 1995

Klaus Fittschen. "Zur Bildnisstatue des Kleonikos des Jünglings von Eretria". *Eirene. Studia greca et latina (in honorem Jan Bouzek)* 31 (1995), 98–108.

Fröhlich 2013

Pierre Fröhlich. "Book review of Andrzej S. Chankowski *L'éphébie hellénistique. Etude d'une institution civique dans les cités grecques des îles de la Mer Egée et de l'Asie Mineure*, Paris 2010". *Topoi* 18.2 (2013), 517–533.

Frothingham and Marquand 1895

Arthur Lincoln Jr. Frothingham and Allan Marquand. "Archaeological News". *The American Journal of Archaeology and of the History of the Fine Arts* 10 (1895), 233–286 and 369–438.

Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993

Philippe Gauthier and Miltiade B. Hatzopoulos. *La loi gymnasiarchique de Béroia*. Athens: Ethnikon Hidryma Ereunōn, 1993.

Gill 2004

Alyson A. Gill. *Balaneia: A Sourcebook for the Greek Bath from Archaic through the Hellenistic Periods*. Ann Arbor: UMI, 2004.

Ginouvés 1962

René Ginouvs. *Balaneutikè. Recherches sur le bain dans l'Antiquité grecque*. Paris: De Boccard, 1962.

Glass 1968

Stephen L. Glass. *Palaistra and Gymnasium in Greek Architecture*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1968.

Heermance 1896

T. Woolsley Heermance. "Fragment of a Dated Panathenaic Amphora from the Gymnasium at Eretria". *American Journal of Archaeology* 11 (1896), 331–334.

Hoepfner 2002

Wolfram Hoepfner. "Pergamon – Rhodos – Nysa – Athen. Bibliotheken in Gymnasien und anderen Lehr- und Forschungsstätten". In *Antike Bibliotheken*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2002, 67–80.

von den Hoff 2009

Ralf von den Hoff. "Hellenistische Gymnasia: Raumgestaltung und Raumfunktionen". In *Stadtbilder im Hellenismus*. Ed. by A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann. Berlin: Verlag Antike, 2009, 245–275.

Hoffmann 1999

Michaela Hoffmann. *Griechische Bäder*. Munich: Herbert Utz Verlag, 1999.

Katsali 2015

Sophia Katsali. "Ο υδάτινος κόσμος της Ερέτριας. Τα λουτρά της αρχαίας πόλης: παλαιά και νέα δεδομένα". In *Αρχαιολογικές Συμβολές. Τόμος Γ: Βοιωτία & Ευβοία, Εφορείες Αρχαιοτήτων Βοιωτίας & Εύβοιας*. Ed. by S. Oikonomou. Athens: Μουσείο Κυκλαδικής Τέχνης, 2015, 235–244.

Knoepfler 1990

Denis Knoepfler. "Dédicaces érétriennes à Ilithyie". *Antike Kunst* 33 (1990), 115–128.

Knoepfler 2001a

Denis Knoepfler. *Eretria XI: Décrets érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté*. Lausanne: Editions Payot, 2001.

Knoepfler 2001b

Denis Knoepfler. "Le contrat d'Érétrie en Eubée pour le drainage de l'étang de Ptéchai". In *Irrigation et drainage dans l'Antiquité, qanāts et canalisations souterraines en Iran, en Égypte et en Grèce*. Ed. by P. Briant. Paris: Thotm Editions, 2001, 41–79.

Knoepfler 2009

Denis Knoepfler. "Débris d'évergésie au gymnase d'Érétrie". In *L'huile et l'argent. Gymnasiarchie et évergétisme dans la Grèce hellénistique, Actes du colloque tenu à Fribourg du 13 au 15 octobre 2005 publiés en l'honneur du Prof. Marcel Piérart à l'occasion de son 60ème anniversaire*. Ed. by O. Curty. Paris: Séminaire d'histoire ancienne de l'Université de Fribourg, 2009, 203–257.

Kourouniotis 1917a

Konstantinos Kourouniotis. "Ἀγγελία. Β' Ἐρετρίας". *Archaiologikē Ephēmeris* (1917), 238–239.

Kourouniotis 1917b

Konstantinos Kourouniotis. "Ἐκθεσις τῶν πεπραγμένων κατὰ τὸ 1917". *Praktika* (1917), 17–18.

Lehmann 2001

Stefan Lehmann. "Der bekleidete Gymnasiast – eine neue Deutung zum Jüngling von Eretria". *Antike Kunst* 44 (2001), 18–23.

Mango 1994

Elena Mango. "Das Gymnasion von Eretria". *Antike Kunst* 37 (1994), 100–104.

Mango 1995

Elena Mango. "Die Ausgrabungen im Gymnasion von Eretria". *Antike Kunst* 38 (1995), 120–125.

Mango 1996

Elena Mango. "Die Ausgrabungen im Gymnasion von Eretria 1995". *Antike Kunst* 39 (1996), 117–121.

Mango 2003

Elena Mango. *Eretria XIII: Das Gymnasion*. Gollion: Infolio Éditions, 2003.

Mango 2004

Elena Mango. "Bankette im hellenistischen Gymnasion". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004, 273–311.

Mango 2010

Elena Mango. "Un esprit sain dans un corps sain: le gymnase et les bains". In *Cité sous terre. Des archéologues suisses explorent la cité grecque d'Érétrie*. Ed. by C. Martin Pruvot, K. Reber, and T. Theurillat. Gollion and Basel: Infolio Éditions, 2010, 157–158.

Martin Pruvot, Reber, and Theurillat 2010

Chantal Martin Pruvot, Karl Reber, and Thierry Theurillat. *Cité sous terre. Des archéologues suisses explorent la cité grecque d'Érétrie: une exposition réalisée par l'Ecole suisse d'archéologie en Grèce en collaboration avec l'Antikenmuseum Basel und Sammlung Ludwig*. Gollion: Infolio, 2010.

Martini 1984

Wolfram Martini. *Samos XVI: Das Gymnasium von Samos*. Bonn: Habelt, 1984.

Pétrakos 1961–1962 [1963]

Vassilis Pétrakos. "Ἐρετρία: Παλαιστρά". *Archaeological Deltion* 17 (1961–1962 [1963]), Β' Χρον., 145.

Richardson 1896a

Rufus Byam Richardson. "Sculpture from the Gymnasium at Eretria". *American Journal of Archaeology* 11 (1896), 165–172.

Richardson 1896b

Rufus Byam Richardson. "The Gymnasium at Eretria". *American Journal of Archaeology* 11 (1896), 152–165.

Salzmann 1982

Dieter Salzmann. *Untersuchungen zu den antiken Kieselmosaiken*. Berlin: Mann, 1982.

Sapouna-Sakellarakis 1995

Efi Sapouna-Sakellarakis. *Eretria. Site and Museum*. Athens: Archaeological, 1995.

Schefold 1964

Karl Schefold. "Eretria. Untersuchungen im Frühjahr 1964". *Antike Kunst* 7 (1964), 102–105.

Schefold 1966

Karl Schefold. "Die Grabungen in Eretria im Herbst 1964 und 1965". *Antike Kunst* 9 (1966), 112–115.

Schmid 2000

Stephan G. Schmid. "Sullan Debris from Eretria (Greece)?" *Rei Cretariae Romanae Fautores Acta* 36 (2000), 169–180.

Spoerri Butcher 2011

Marguerite Spoerri Butcher. "Érétrie (Eubée) aux époques romaine, paléochrétienne et médiévale: l'apport des trouvailles monétaires à l'histoire de la cité". In *Philologos Dionysios, Mélanges offerts au professeur Denis Knoepfler*. Ed. by N. Badoud. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2011, 423–466.

Themelis 1987

Petros G. Themelis. “Ερετριακές Λατρείες.” In *Φίλια έπη εις Γ. Ε. Μύλωναν Β’*. Ed. by P. G. Themelis. Athens: Athen, Ausgabe Hannibal, 1987, 106–124.

Theurillat, Ackermann, Duret, Saggini, et al. 2013

Thierry Theurillat, Guy Ackermann, Marc Duret, Tamara Saggini, and Rocco Tettamanti. “Fouilles E/600 SW (Terrain ‚Sandoz’).” *Antike Kunst* 56 (2013), 90–100.

Theurillat, Ackermann, Duret, and Tettamanti 2012

Thierry Theurillat, Guy Ackermann, Marc Duret, and Rocco Tettamanti. “Fouilles E/600 SW (Terrain ‚Sandoz’).” *Antike Kunst* 55 (2012), 140–151.

Theurillat, Ackermann, Tettamanti, et al. 2014

Thierry Theurillat, Guy Ackermann, Rocco Tettamanti, Marc Duret, Tamara Saggini, and Simone Zurbriggen. “Fouilles E/600 SW (Terrain ‚Sandoz’).” *Antike Kunst* 57 (2014), 116–1126.

Theurillat, Dubosson, Ackermann, et al. 2011

Thierry Theurillat, Benoît Dubosson, Guy Ackermann, Marc Duret, and Rocco Tettamanti. “Fouilles E/600 SW (Terrain ‚Sandoz’).” *Antike Kunst* 54 (2011), 135–142.

Theurillat, Dubosson, and Duret 2010

Thierry Theurillat, Benoît Dubosson, and Marc Duret. “Fouilles E/600 SW (Terrain ‚Sandoz’).” *Antike Kunst* 53 (2010), 141–146.

Trombetti 2013

Catia Trombetti. *Il ginnasio greco. Genesi, topografia e culti dei luoghi della paideia*. BAR International Series 2527. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2013.

Trümper 2015

Monika Trümper. “Modernization and Change of Function of Hellenistic Gymnasia in the Imperial Period : Case-Studies Pergamon, Miletus and Priene.” In *Das kaiserzeitliche Gymnasium*. Ed. by P. Scholz and D. Wiegandt. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015, 167–221.

Veuve 1987

Serge Veuve. *Fouilles d’Ai Khanoum VI : Le Gymnase. Architecture, céramique, sculpture*. Paris: De Boccard, 1987.

Wacker 1996

Christian Wacker. *Das Gymnasium in Olympia. Geschichte und Funktion*. Würzburg: Ergon-Verlag, 1996.

Winter 2006

Frederick E. Winter. *Studies in Hellenistic Architecture*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.

Yegül 1992

Fikret Yegül. *Baths and Bathing in Classical Antiquity*. London: Architectural History Foundation, 1992.

Zschietzschmann 1961

Willy Zschietzschmann. *Wettkampf- und Übungsstätten in Griechenland. Stadion – Palästra – Gymnasion. Eine Übersicht: II. Palästra – Gymnasion*. Stuttgart: Schorndorf-Verlag, 1961.

Illustration and plate credits

ILLUSTRATIONS: 1 ESAG rendering, Rocco Tettamanti. 2 ESAG photo, Rocco Tettamanti. 3 ESAG rendering, Thierry Theurillat. **PLATES:** 1 Zeichnung ESAG,

Rocco Tettamanti. 2 Photo ESAG, Rocco Tettamanti. 3 Zeichnungen ESAG, Thierry Theurillat. 4 Zeichnung ESAG, Thierry Theurillat.

GUY ACKERMANN

M. A. (Lausanne 2011), PhD (Lausanne 2018), member of the Ecole française d’Athènes (EFA) and scientific member of the Swiss School of Archaeology in Greece (ESAG). His research focuses on the pottery of the Hellenistic period in Eretria (PhD thesis) and the excavations of the ancient gymnasium. He also collaborates in publishing on the Roman thermae of Eretria.

Dr. Guy Ackermann
Ecole française d’Athènes
6, Odos Didotou
10680 Athens, Greece
E-Mail: guy.ackermann@efa.gr

KARL REBER

Dr. phil. (Basel 1986), Habilitation (Basel 1995), Professor of Classical Archaeology at the University of Lausanne and Director of the Swiss School of Archaeology in Greece (ESAG). His research focuses on the Dark Ages, the domestic architecture in Greece, the excavations of the ancient gymnasium of Eretria, and the ancient sites of Euboea.

Prof. Dr. Karl Reber
Institut d’archéologie et des sciences de l’Antiquité (IASA)
Anthropole 4011
Université de Lausanne
1015 Lausanne, France
E-Mail: karl.reber@unil.ch

Ulrich Mania

Gymnasial Buildings and Sanctuaries. A Contribution to the Formation of the Palaestra and an Interpretation of the So-Called ‘Echo Stoa’

Summary

The emergence of the palaestra as a distinctive building in the form of the peristyle is commonly assigned to the last third of the 4th century BC. While sources show that palaestras existed already earlier, no example has yet been safely identified. This paper argues that some buildings in extra-urban sanctuaries on the Peloponnesus with a set of functions in the context of athletics and competition could represent such early gymnasial buildings. The examples from Nemea and Epidauros lead to the building complex of the Echo-Stoa in Olympia which was very likely built as the first palaestra of the precinct. This building complex might reflect the appearance of early gymnasial buildings before the peristyle was introduced as an obligatory architectural form of palaestras.

Keywords: Olympia; Epidauros; Nemea; gymnasium; palaestra; Echo stoa

Das Aufkommen der Palästra als Gebäude in Form eines Peristyls kann ins letzte Drittel des 4. Jhs. v. Chr. datiert werden, wobei die schriftlichen Quellen zeigen, dass es bereits früher Palästren gab. Von diesen ist aber noch keine sicher identifiziert worden. In diesem Beitrag wird davon ausgegangen, dass einige Gebäude in außerstädtischen Heiligtümern auf der Peloponnes, die mit Funktionen des Sports, des Wettkampfs und der Körperpflege verbunden werden können, solche frühen Palästren repräsentieren. Die Beispiele in den großen Heiligtümern von Nemea und Epidauros führen zum Gebäudekomplex der Echo-Stoa in Olympia, der sehr wahrscheinlich als erste Palästra in dem Heiligtum angesprochen werden kann.

Keywords: Olympia; Epidauros; Nemea; Gymnasion; Palästra; Echo-Stoa

1 Introduction

The building type of the palaestra – a peristyle with aisles for circulation and adjacent rooms, often in the design of exedras – occurs in the archaeological record at several places in different regions first in the 2nd half of the 4th century BC. The earliest known palaestras are located in Athens, Eretria, Delphi, Amphipolis and Priene.¹

The widespread occurrence of these buildings within a short historical period suggests that the idea of the palaestra is older than the buildings in the archaeological record and in fact the term ‘palaestra’ for a gymnasial building is already attested in Plato’s *Lysis* shortly after 400 BC. He reports that Socrates was walking along the northern city walls of Athens when he noticed a door next to a well leading into a precinct (περίβολος). Inside, handsome young men lingered. Socrates asked what the building could be and got the answer it was a palaestra, recently built and it served the purpose of instruction and discussion.² Despite the fact that the first peristyles date to the same time and were well known in Athens since the so-called Pompeion was built next to the Dipylon gate around 400 BC, it is not known what Plato’s gymnasial building looked like.³ As the earliest known palaestras in the form of a peristyle were erected at least half a century later, probably Plato’s palaestra was nothing else than a walled court.

As there is a time lag between palaestras attested in literature and the widespread earliest palaestras in the shape of a peristyle, we have to widen our view to find further potential gymnasial buildings of the 4th century BC. Since Pausanias records the existence of a gymna-

sium and a palaestra in the Sanctuary of Zeus of Olympia it might be possible to find candidates in extra-urban sanctuaries.⁴ According to him, it was customary for the pentathletes participating in the Olympian Games to practice there. Running, jumping, discus-throwing and javelin-throwing are mentioned by the author in connection with the so-called gymnasium. Wrestling, the fifth type of sport in the pentathlon, took place in a second enclosure. Pausanias calls this the palaestra and locates it to the left of the entrance to the gymnasium. Scholars agree in the identification of gymnasium and palaestra with a large building complex in the northwest of the sanctuary (Pl. 21)⁵. The Olympian palaestra perfectly corresponds to what we understand by the synonymous building type: an unpaved quadrangle framed by a Doric peristyle, surrounded by Ionic exedras and with an emphasized northern wing housing a main exedra in the middle and a loutron with washbasins at both ends. Following the stylistic characteristics of the Ionic ornament of the palaestra and a terminus ante quem in 280 BC given by Pausanias who mentions a victory inscription from that year, which was present in the building, the palaestra was built not later than in the first quarter of the 3rd century BC.⁶ The suggested usage of the building as a place for wrestling and physical exercise corresponds with the design of the floors in the quadrangle, the aisles and the exedras with an unpaved and thus soft surface. Circumferential benches along the walls of the exedras served as resting places and as seats for visitors. Directly linked to the building’s proposed use for physical exercise are the two wash rooms among further facilities for body care.⁷

- 1 Athens: Palaestra in the so-called Academia (Delorme 1960, 38–42, 51–54; Travlos 1971, 42–51; Wacker 1996, 145–160; Trombetti 2012 330–336; Trombetti 2013, 6–29; Emme 2013b, 148–149, 316 no. 12; Kazakidi 2015, 213–214; A. Caruso in this volume); Eretria: double palaestra of the North Gymnasium (Delorme 1960, 16–164; Mango 2003; Emme 2013b, 329 no. 31; Trombetti 2013, 116–127; Reber 2014, 134–141; G. Ackermann and K. Reber in this volume); Delphi (Jannoray 1953; Delorme 1960, 76–80; Wacker 1996, 195–207; Emme 2013b, 324–325 no. 24; Amphipolis (Delorme 1960, 206–207; Lazaridis 1990; Wacker 1996, 143–144; Koukouli-Chrysantaki 2002, 57–73; Emme 2013b, 310–311 no. 3; Kazakidi 2015, 255–257); Priene: According to the latest excavations in the so-called Upper Gymnasium by the author the building dates back to the 4th century BC.
- 2 Plat. *Lys.* 203a–204a.206e. The book dates to shortly after 400 BC; cf. Delorme 1960, 60.
- 3 According to Emme 2013b, 295 buildings with proto-peristyles trace back to the 6th century BC. In Delos the earliest peristyle buildings occurred in the middle of the 5th century BC. Athens determined further developments with the earliest relatively large peristyles like the Pom-

peion and the π -shaped portico in the sanctuary of Artemis in Brauron at the end of the 5th century BC.

- 4 Paus. 6.21.2.
- 5 Firstly Adler, Curtius, and Dörpfeld 1892, 113–121 (cf. B. Emme in this volume).
- 6 Wacker 1996, 25–44 (with earlier sources) and Pausanias 6.6.3. Wacker dates the capitals to the early 3rd century BC but there is no compelling reason to exclude an earlier construction date (cf. B. Emme in this volume).
- 7 The loutron at the north-western corner of the building is well preserved. The corresponding room in the northeast was heavily remodeled in later times but since it has the same outline as the western room and since there is evidence of water supply, it is very likely to have been used as a second loutron. An open air loutron between the early Roman Propylon and the north-eastern corner of the palaestra with a row of sinks in front of the northern wall and a row of recessed basins along the south side of the yard is a later addition. Finally, brick paved areas along the northern and western side of the court of the palaestra have to be men-

Pausanias' 'Gymnasium' was erected on the northern side of the Olympian palaestra probably in late Hellenistic times.⁸ Excavations brought to light mainly a huge double-aisled Doric portico. The width of its front opening measures roughly 192.5 metres and coincides perfectly with the length of the Olympian stadium. This and the existence of a starting block determine the function of the portico as a roofed dromos or xystos.⁹ According to Pausanias, the gymnasium originally was an enclosure with buildings which framed a courtyard on all four sides.¹⁰ Following this, the appearance of this building would have been similar to several 2nd century BC enclosures, for example in Miletus, Kos and Ephesus which were part of civic gymnasia and served most likely as training grounds for types of sport requiring space.¹¹

Looking at the palaestra and the gymnasium in Olympia raises the question of what the terms mean in the context of a sanctuary. Since a palaestra firstly was seen as a place for wrestling it is connected to the physical evidence of an open-air sand courtyard or, more elaborate than that, a peristyle building with the wrestling place in its center. The term gymnasium embraces a wider range of meanings. The designation of a certain building is only one part of it. Beyond physical exercise, it designates gen-

erally the school as an institution or the youths as a group attending it.¹² In summary, a palaestra is first of all a place for physical exercises whilst a gymnasium describes a key institution of the polis state with all its functions, offices, user groups and buildings, amongst them the palaestra as a central part of a gymnasium. The wider sense of the term with a close relation to the polis state does not work in an extra-urban sanctuary several days' journey from the nearest polis: This fact is proved by the complete absence of gymnasia officials in Olympia.¹³ As there is no evidence for the institution of the gymnasium in Olympia it may be assumed that the terms refer, above all, to the visual appearance of the 'palaestra' and the 'gymnasium' and their use as sport facilities.

2 Athletic Facilities in Panhellenic Sanctuaries of the 4th century BC

As we have seen, the gymnasia building complex in Olympia is unique but 'gymnasia buildings' occur in other sanctuaries as well. They differ from Olympia in their architectural form but contain a similar set of functions.¹⁴ This is demonstrated by the example of the Ne-

tioned which probably served as places where athletes removed the mixture of dust, sweat and oil after physical exercise. These paved areas were located alongside a gutter surrounding the court and permanently supplied with fresh water by a channel which enters the palaestra from east (similar paved areas exist in the palaestras at Amphipolis and Pergamon, for example).

8 Adler, Curtius, and Dörpfeld 1892, 128; Wacker 1996, 45–47, 56. As there is neither stratigraphic evidence nor a basis for dating Hellenistic Doric capitals, the date of the erection of the building is not known. Recent excavations conducted by the ephoria in 2014 in the eastern portico of the building are unpublished.

9 On the length of the stadium see Herrmann 1972, 164, 194. On the remains of a starting device see Adler, Curtius, and Dörpfeld 1892, 128; Delorme 1960, 106; Hellner 2013, 277.

10 Pausanias 6.21.2 calls the palaestra the "ἄλλος περίβολος". Hence the aforementioned gymnasium has to be an enclosure too. See Delorme 1960, 106 "Il est probable que ces portiques fussent dans l'antiquité les deux seuls du gymnase."

11 B. Emme recently interpreted the so-called 'Westmarkt' in Miletus as a part of the large Eumenes Gymnasium consisting of a stadium, a palaestra and the xystos complex, alias 'Westmarkt' (Emme 2013a, 61–63). The existence of similar building complexes at the later 'Staatsmarkt' in Ephesos (Engelmann 1993; Thür 2007) and within the West-Gymnasium of Kos (Morricone 1950, 224–227; Rocco 1997) is very likely.

12 LSJ s. v. "γυμνάσιον"; <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/ljsj/#eid=23760&context=lsj&action=from-search> (visited on 06/01/2016). On the meaning of the terms gymnasium and palaestra and their differentiation mainly in respect of their architecture see Mango 2003, 18–20 (with a summary of the history of the two concepts); Trümper 2008, 88 and Trümper 2015, 169; cf. Delorme 1960, 253–271, 266–267.

13 When gymnasiarchs are mentioned in inscriptions their offices are al-

ways related to other poleis and never to Olympia itself. For example, the *ὑποταρχία* in I. Olympia 55 is related to Tiberius Claudius Rufus in Smyrna; a *ὑποστάρχης* in I. Olympia 56 is the member of a *pompē* on the occasion of games in Neapolis; the *γυμνάσιαρχία* mentioned in I. Olympia 433–434, 436, 468, is part of honorific decrees for officials of Elis; the *γυμνάσιαρχος* in I. Olympia 283 is an official of Elis and dedicated a statue in the precinct. The commemorative inscription I. Olympia 940 by the demos of Elis and the *boulē* of Olympia records a *γυμνάσιαρχία* with an uncertain affiliation. – Furthermore, none of the Olympian inscriptions attest a palaestra or even a gymnasium situated in the precinct. The only gymnasium which occurs in the epigraphical record is the old gymnasium of Elis, which was called the "Xystos"; I. Olympia 54 and 436, see Dittenberger and Purgold 1896, 111–118, 527–529, with a dating to AD 85 and the 2nd century AD, respectively. This unconventional label for a gymnasium and its function is again explained by Pausanias 6.23.1: It was used as training facility for athletes taking part in the Olympic games during a 30-day period prior to the competitions in the sanctuary. – Exceptional is the decree I. Olympia 56 mentioning a further gymnasium in the context of the organization of games at Neapolis in Italy (reign of Trajan or Hadrian according to Dittenberger and Purgold 1896, 118–126).

14 Typologically the closest examples to the palaestra of Olympia in the context of an extra-urban sanctuary can be found in Epidauros and Kourion on Cyprus. Both peristyle buildings have been interpreted as palaestras as well but they include closed rooms and not exedras. Furthermore, in both buildings couches and podiums for dining and cooking facilities were found. It has to be assumed that they represent banquet buildings rather than palaestras; for Epidauros see Tomlinson 1983, 82–84; cf. Mango 2004, 284; Leybold 2008, 60–68; the unpublished building in Kourion has two rooms containing couches and a third room with cooking facilities.

mean sanctuary: With the sanctuary of Olympia the precinct shares not only the worship of Zeus but also the position in a rural landscape and its periodical use with thousands of visitors during festivals.¹⁵ For the holding of diverse athletic contests within these festivals the sanctuary is equipped with specific infrastructure. Above all, there is the stadium at the eastern edge of the precinct. It was built in the last third of the 4th century BC.¹⁶ A tunnel through the western embankment of the stadium connects the race track with a rectangular building (Fig. 1). Its dimensions are 16 by 13 m. An entrance in the north leads into a square court about 8 m in size surrounded by a three-sided Doric portico. The excavator named it the 'Apodyterion,' changing room.

A very similar and even more elaborate building is situated north of the stadium at the Asclepius Sanctuary of Epidauros.¹⁷ It covers an approximately square area with a width of 40 m (Fig. 1). The building consists of an oblong courtyard with a Doric colonnade on its southern side; a hall to the north of this courtyard with a number of passages on each long side and five Ionic columns along its axis; and a kind of vestibule on the northernmost side of the complex.¹⁸ Again there is a tunnel connecting the building, which was called a palaestra by its excavator, with the racetracks in the stadium. It is believed that the stadium, tunnel and the above-mentioned building at the northern embankment of the stadium originate from one building program from the period between the last third of the 4th century BC and the early 3rd century BC.¹⁹ It has been pointed out that Argos controlled the Sanctuaries of Nemea and Epidauros during the 330s and 320s BC.²⁰ Thus, it is no surprise to find similar architectural patterns in similar contexts within the same time frame. Stephen Miller de-

finied these building units in Nemea and Epidauros as stadium-tunnel-locker complexes, an architectural type which connected stadia and facilities for athletes. A possible set of functions for these facilities was deduced from their position and design: Athletes used them for undressing/dressing, warming up, oiling or cleaning the body before and after competitions.²¹

If athletes used these buildings for body care, washing facilities are missing. I suggest that the stadium-tunnel-locker complexes of Nemea and Epidauros were functionally supplemented by a particular form of baths, the so-called athlete baths, which contain a *loutron* with its characteristic sinks and a plunge basin. Only the example in Nemea is well investigated. It is contemporaneous with the stadium complex and lies in the center of the precinct next to the so-called *Xenon*.²² The bath consists of two square compartments. The eastern compartment is divided into three sections by two rows of Doric columns. One section houses a plunge pool framed by two rooms with washbasins (*loutrons*). The middle section was probably a courtyard and the third a portico. The second compartment with the same size as the first one is attached at its eastern side and has four columns inside, most likely creating a peristyle-like structure with a wooden entablature.²³ Also the less well known bath in the sanctuary of Asklepios in Epidauros is not placed in the vicinity of the stadium but next to the *hestiatorion*. Again it contained at least one *loutron* with the characteristic washbasins and at the eastern side most likely an immersion pool. It is said the bath was built in the 2nd half of the 4th century BC.²⁴

Washbasins for cold ablutions such as in the two athlete baths are known from the second half of the 5th century BC onwards and were an integral part of palastras

15 Whilst in Olympia and Delphi the Panhellenic festivals recurred every four years, in Nemea and Isthmia the interval was only two years. Local festivals were celebrated here as well; Miller 1990, 2–3.

16 Miller 2001, 90–93. The building complex was not finished by 271 BC when the Nemean games were transferred to Argos. It began falling into disrepair already in the 3rd century BC.

17 Kavvadias 1929; Tomlinson 1983, 69, 91; Miller 2001, 178–190. The building is not properly published as its excavator, P. Kavvadias, died shortly after its discovery. Thanks to Miller's efforts the building was superficially re-examined in the 1990s.

18 Patrucco 1976, 16 fig. 3 published a sketchy (and incorrect) plan of the building for the first time. The only published, but quite small-scale, plan was published by Tomlinson 1983, fig. 44. This figure depicts an obliquely orientated room at the western side of the building. Miller

2001, 178–182 demonstrated that this structure did not belong to the ancient building.

19 Miller 2001, 184–189; cf. Patrucco 1976, 100–102, 116.

20 Miller 2001, 189–190 n. 440.

21 Miller 2001, 209–210, 222–224; cf. Koenigs 1984, 84.

22 Miller 1992, 246. Evidence comes from some sherds in the foundation trenches dating no earlier than the 2nd half of the 4th century BC. On the athlete baths in Nemea and Epidauros and a further example in Oropos (Lykeion mountains) Trümper 2014, 209, 214 n. 22, and 56.

23 Miller 1992, 232–236 reconstructs a west–east orientated gabled roof over the entire building.

24 Kavvadias 1900, 154–155, with the idea that the building represents a Hellenistic bath; cf. Ginouvès 1962, 359; Aslanidis and Pinatsi 1999; Wassenhoven 2012, 125; Trümper 2014, 216–222.




Fig. 1 Stadium-tunnel-locker-complexes in the Sanctuary of Zeus in Nemea (left) and the Sanctuary of Asclepius from Epidauros (right).

until Roman imperial times. Therefore the two baths have been interpreted as facilities for athletes, like the stadium-tunnel-locker complexes.²⁵

3 An Early Palaestra in Olympia?

At this point we have to go back to Olympia where Miller again identified a stadium-tunnel-locker complex.²⁶ It consists of a 96 m long and 8 m wide semi-roofed court between the Echo Stoa and the western embankment of the stadium (Fig. 2, 3, Pl. 1, 2).

A door in the northern narrow side of the court provides access into the passageway between Altis and stadium. The similarities to the above-mentioned building complexes in Nemea and Epidauros are evident but

as Miller neglected in his consideration a huge part of the building complex and its specific building history it seems necessary to reinvestigate the issue.

The complex incorporates the Echo Stoa at the eastern edge of the Altis, the courtyard behind this stoa, and the passageway north of the two buildings. At first glance the courtyard seems to be an accidental result of the erection of the portico in front of the stadium embankment but it has been shown that portico, courtyard and the retaining wall at the bottom of the embankment are linked together and are part of an integral building concept.²⁷ The construction date of this ensemble is the early second half of the 4th century BC.²⁸ Miller's interpretation of the building focuses on the courtyard and the passageway into the stadium only. Furthermore, he attributes the shed roof attached to the rear side of the Echo Stoa

25 Miller 1992, 244–250. The distance to the tunnel-stadium-locker complexes and the vicinity to other public buildings of the sanctuaries imply that the baths served as washing facilities not only for athletes but also for other guests of the precincts. Trümper 2014, 217–219 argues for a multifunctional usage of the building according to its topographical and architectural characteristics.

26 Miller 2001, 190–210. A further candidate might be the Panathenaic Stadium in Athens: This stadium also was built in the last third of the 4th century BC but the rebuilding phases of Hadrianic times and the late 19th century make study difficult today; Miller 2001, 210–222.

27 Kunze and Schleif 1938, 49; cf. Miller 2001, 190–192 n. 449–450. Schilbach 1992, 34–35, dates the western embankment to the second

quarter of the 5th century BC (“Stadion III”). In order to gain enough space for the erection of the Echo Stoa and its backyard the base of the embankment was cut away and replaced by a low retaining wall. On the genesis of the stadium in Olympia in general, see Mallwitz 1967 and Schilbach 1992.

28 Koenigs 1984, 1–6, and especially 4. Ceramic findings from the filling of the foundation trenches give a terminus post quem in the middle of the 4th century BC. To the dating of the completion of the first building phase in the timeframe between 340 and 330 BC see also footnote 48. Following Koenigs, this date coincides with metrical characteristics of the building; Koenigs 1984, 20–22; cf. Kunze and Schleif 1938, 56; Schilbach 1992, 35; Miller 2001, 192.




Fig. 2 Reconstruction drawing of the Echo stoa and adjacent buildings, section from south. Black = first building phase in the 2nd half of the 4th c. BC; red = Monuments erected in the front of the unfinished stoa and Hellenistic modifications; green = completion of the Echo-stoa in Augustan time and later.



Fig. 3 Echo-stoa from north-west and the area of the court behind the building and the stadium wall.




Fig. 4 Retaining wall of the western stadium embankment (left) with water channel in the front and a later wall cutting the channel (right).

to the first building stage (Fig. 2). Only this assumption provides evidence to establish a link to the other 'lockers' with the combination of courtyard, portico and stadium tunnel.²⁹ But the contrary was the case: the shed roof was not built before the final building phase of the Echo Stoa in Augustan times.³⁰ If we omit the shed roof from the discussion, the question arises why the Echo Stoa itself is not recognized as a part of the building complex under consideration.

Surprisingly, the intention behind the erection of this building – a nearly 100 m long Doric portico with an impressive depth of 9.5 m and 44 columns in the front – has never been convincingly explained: The description of a battle between the Arcadians as defenders of the sanctuary and the Eleans as attackers during games in the year 364 BC by Xenophon represents the starting point for all related considerations.³¹ Xenophon reports that the Arcadians and Pisatans held the competitions of the pentathlon in the race tracks of the stadium. When the competitors, who had reached the wrestling contest, were no longer on the race track but were wrestling in the space between the stadium and the altar, the enemy arrived. This information is important for the identification of the area between the Altar of Zeus and the stadium, commonly known as the Altis, as the wrestling area or rather literally the palaestra. The following sentences refer to the battle between the two warring parties: The Eleans fought from the roofs of the porticoes, the Bouleuterion and the temple itself while the others tried to defend the area between the Bouleuterion, the temple of Hestia and the Theatron that adjoins these buildings. According to J. Schilbach the peak of the western stadium wall, which was raised in the first half of the 4th century BC, and the steep slope in front of the terrace of the Treasure houses formed this so-called The-

atron and served as a place for spectators at the wrestling contests in the Altis.³² W. Koenigs identified at least the western embankment of the stadium with the Theatron and concluded that the Echo Stoa inherited its function as an audience space.³³ Furthermore the terrace of the treasure houses with its stepped retaining wall, which was built at the same time as the Echo Stoa, would have used as stands and provided a good view on the scenery (Pl. 2).³⁴ It is to assume, that the Echo stoa was not solely used as an audience hall. With its depth of 9.5 m only its front provided view on the Altis. The interior of the stoa must have had rather a multifunctional use. I would like to suggest to interpret the whole building ensemble as the first palaestra of Olympia consisting of a patch of ground for wrestling in front of the stoa, a huge multifunctional portico and space for an audience. In this setting the portico formed an architectural frame and provided opportunity for assembly and practice during bad weather. Furthermore, the building complex gave access for athletes to the stadium and contained facilities for body care. These two features have to be explained more carefully:

3.1 Water installations

Along the front side of the Echo Stoa runs an open water channel with inserted basins in front of every tenth column (Fig. 2, Pl. 1). Usually, such channels served as drainage for rainwater pouring down from the waterspouts along the sima. But this was not the only function of this gutter: Its gentle gradient is directed to the south. In the north it continued up to the foot of the retaining wall of the terrace of the treasure houses. This wall contained a fresh-water feeding channel and permanently supplied the gutter with its basins in front of the

29 Miller 1992, 192 n. 450, misunderstood Koenigs 1984, 84, and assumed that the shed roof could be already part of the original plan. Sinn 1996, 58–59, refers to the court behind the portico as an apodyterium without any discussion of the relation between the portico and the shed roof.

30 Koenigs 1984, 26, 84 fig. 15. "Über das zeitliche Verhältnis der Echohalle läßt sich nur sagen, daß das Pultdach selbst nachträglich an die fertige Halle der Phase C angebaut wurde [...]"

31 Xen. *Hell.* 7.4.29 and 31. The Arcadians ruled over the sanctuary between 365 and 362 BC. On the historical background see Ringel, Siewert, and Tauber 1999, 414; cf. Diod. 15.78.2.

32 Schilbach 1992, 34–35.

33 Koenigs 1981, 367–368, and (briefly) Koenigs 1984, 84.

34 Originally, the archaic treasure houses were built on a terrace made from dumped material. Towards the Altis this terrace merged into a slope. When the Echo Stoa and its attached buildings were erected, this slope was cut away and replaced by a stepped retaining wall with a height of more than 3 m. Each step of this wall is about 0.24 m high and 0.22 m deep (a section of this stepped wall in the area of its western end is shown in Schilbach 1984, 233 fig. 12). In the east towards the stadium entrance, this wall becomes steadily higher as the level of the Altis falls. The higher parts of the wall consist of a stepped upper zone and a vertical lower base zone. On the erection date of this wall at the time of the erection of the Echo Stoa and its adjacent buildings, see Schilbach 1992, 35, and with an extensive discussion of previous scholarly research Miller 2001, 190–210.

stoa.³⁵ Similar channels fed with fresh water and supplemented with basins are well known from stadiums like Nemea and Epidauros and from several palaestras.³⁶ The water supply and the existence of these water systems not only in front of columnar halls but also in stadiums make clear that we have to assume functions not only in relation to the drainage of rainwater but also to athletic activities. Well investigated is the channel system in the stadium of Nemea with a small fountain at its southern narrow side feeding water channels with interposed basins extending along both sides of the race track.³⁷ The installation demonstrates that one important feature was the provision of water allowing the athletes to wash and refresh themselves. The inserted basins in this context must have served as water deposits and facilities for drawing water.

A second water facility in the context of the building complex in Olympia is situated in the courtyard behind the portico where a channel runs along the top of the retaining wall of the stadium embankment (Fig. 2, 4, Pl. 1). Also this gutter is connected to and fed by the water channel at the foot of the retaining wall of the treasure houses and conducts water possibly to the hippodrome which location in the southeast of the stadium is a debated issue.³⁸ For a length of about 71 m, the east side of the court is flanked by this raised water channel. It is 0.35 m wide and around 0.22 m deep. Its upper edge reaches a height of 1.1 m above ground. Consequently, the water was easily accessible from the court and the channel might have served as a washing facil-

ity in the postulated first palaestra of Olympia. Already Koenigs on the basis of the water channel vaguely assumed the court was used as washing place.³⁹ As the usage of an open raised channel for body cleaning would be unique, Miller considered the possibility that washing basins have stood along the retaining wall and have been fed by the channel.⁴⁰ As the very scarce remains of the channel do not show any outlets which could support this hypothesis, one appropriate washbasin made from limestone was found in secondary use at the base of the terrace wall of the treasure houses and might be interpreted as a remnant of such a Lutron in the courtyard.⁴¹ A comparable example for this setting provide the two Lutrons in the athlete bath in Nemea: Its wash basins were aligned along the rear walls of the bathing rooms. A horizontal channel in each of the walls led water to outlets from where it poured into the basins.⁴² Also in the Lower Gymnasium of Priene a channel run along the walls of the Lutron and fed a row of basins below.⁴³ In difference to the Lutron in Nemea and the supposed Lutron behind the Echo stoa in Olympia the channel in Priene contained a pipe with nozzles which ended in the waterspouts.⁴⁴ The two examples from Nemea and Priene at least show that the height of the channel in the court behind the Echo stoa with 1.1 m would have been in a range which was suitable for feeding washing basins.⁴⁵ However, if the channel on top of the embankment wall fed washing basins or was used as washing facility itself remains uncertain. Also the question whether the floor of the court was covered with stone slabs and if

35 The description of the channel by Kunze and Schleif 1938, 57–59, was updated by Koenigs 1984, 84–85. The chronological relation between the channel and the terrace wall of the treasure houses is debated: Kunze and Schleif 1938, 58, pointed out that the retaining wall must be younger than the portico, Schilbach 1992, 35 and Miller 2001, 208–209, date both buildings to the same building phase.

36 Permanently water fed gutters with or without inserted sinks are known from the palaestras of the Lower Gymnasium in Priene, the Upper Gymnasium in Eretria, the Gymnasia in Pergamon, Messene, Kalydon, Sikyon and the palaestra of Olympia. The striking difference to many similar installations in buildings of other purposes is the permanent water flow in the channels of these palaestras.

37 The hydraulic system belongs to the original plan of the stadium from the last third of the 4th century BC; Miller 2001, 15–23, 92–93.

38 As the entrance into the stadium crosses the connection between the channel in the wall in front of the treasure houses and the channel on top of the retaining wall of the stadium embankment, the connection is managed by a siphon (Pl. 1). Conversions of the stadium entrance resulted in modifications of the siphon which ensured that the water

always flowed through the open channel on top of the embankment wall. Miller 2001, 206–209, summarizes these construction phases; cf. Heilmeyer 1984.

39 Koenigs 1984, 84.

40 Miller 2001, 210.

41 Kunze and Schleif 1938, 55–59.

42 To the bath in Nemea see Miller 1992, 188–261. The bath dates in the 2nd half of the 4th century BC. Miller 1992, 20–210, assumes that metallic nozzles in the holes generated jets which gushed in the basins.

43 Wiegand and Schrader 1904, 269–271; Krischen 1925, 141; Delorme 1960, 193–194; Schede 1934, 86–88; Rumscheid 1998, 208; Ferla 2005, 174–175.

44 H. Fahlbusch verbally pointed out that only lead pipes and nozzles would have created a controlled jet which was suitable to fill the basins. Similar systems with lead pipes and nozzles very likely existed in the Lutrons of the palaestrae of Amphipolis and Delphi.

45 The height of the channel in Nemea above ground is 0.87 m only; in Priene the channel reaches a height of 1.18 m.

there existed a drainage or not is not answered since the remains are scarce. Last but not least the Lutron in the palaestra of Delphi has to be mentioned as a comparable example. This Lutron was situated in a court under open sky too and the washing basins were fed by a pipe system with waterspouts in a retaining wall at the eastern side of the court.⁴⁶ Stone slabs on the floor and sewers of this Lutron are preserved.

3.2 Access to the stadium

I have already pointed out the fact that Miller did not consider the possibility of a connection between the Echo Stoa and the courtyard behind it. This made him believe that Olympia represented again a stadium-tunnel-locker complex like in Nemea, Epidauros and elsewhere. But is it likely that a nearly 100 m long courtyard was only accessible from a single door in its northern narrow side wall (Pl. 1)? Already Koenigs pleaded for the existence of passageways in the rear wall of the Echo stoa connecting the portico with the courtyard.⁴⁷ As the rear wall of the early Echo Stoa has not survived in the required height, these postulated doors remain in the darkness of conjecture. However, the existence of the court behind the stoa calls for more accesses than the single door. Therefore I would like to follow Koenigs suggestion and assume that passageways in the rear wall of the stoa created a spatial and functional connection between the wrestling place on the Altis and the adjacent stadium via the stoa and the court with their different washing facilities. Following this the building complex in the east of the Altis displayed distinctive features of many later palaestras in Hellenistic poleis.

The following building history of the Echo stoa in the context of the development of the whole sanctuary can support the interpretation of the building complex as the first palaestra of the precinct. Surprisingly, at the end of the first building phase around 340–330 BC only the courtyard, the krepis, the rear and side walls

of the portico were completed.⁴⁸ For the next three centuries the ensemble stayed in this incomplete state until it was finished in Augustan times using the architectural members of a dismantled 4th century portico of unknown origin (Fig. 2, Pl. 1 green colored building parts).⁴⁹ An explanation for this sudden slowdown of the building activities at the Echo stoa during the last third of the 4th century BC could be the erection of the four-sided peristyle-like palaestra with all the appurtenances of the building type at the north-western edge of the precinct precisely during this period. The construction of a further building with a similar set of functions and, above all, with the up-to-date design of a palaestra might have caused less enthusiasm for the building project between Altis and stadium. It is even possible that with the erection of the four-sided palaestra wrestling did not take place in the Altis anymore but moved completely into the new building. This functional change of the wrestling place on the Altis is illustrated by the erection of many dedications in front of the uncompleted Echo Stoa during the Hellenistic era: These monuments occupied the space which was used for wrestling contests during the 4th century BC and they covered over time the front of the unfinished stoa. Furthermore, the so-called Zanes bases were placed along the base of the terrace wall below the treasure houses and terminated the use of the stepped wall as stands.⁵⁰

4 Conclusion

Pausanias named the two huge buildings in the north-west of the sanctuary of Olympia palaestra and gymnasium. As the institution of the gymnasium did not exist in the extra urban precinct the naming refers to the visual appearance of the building complex: As comparable examples several Hellenistic gymnasia can be named with similar extended training areas flanked by Xystoi. The 'palaestra' precisely quotes the eponymous building

⁴⁶ Jannoray 1953, 55–61; Ginouvès 1962, 133–135.

⁴⁷ Koenigs 1984, 82.

⁴⁸ Koenigs 1984, 25–26; for a summary of the building history of the entire complex Koenigs 1984, 4.

⁴⁹ Koenigs 1984, 28–64. The shed roof in the court behind the Echo Stoa belongs to this Augustan building phase. According to Koenigs 1984, 83–84 it is not likely that this roof was a provisional substitute for the

unfinished portico during Hellenistic times.


⁵⁰ Unfortunately, we have no evidence for the function of the Echo Stoa when it was finished in Augustan times. The erection of the so-called 'Südstadt' in Early Imperial times as a seat for a congregation of athletes (Sinn 1995, 231–238) suggests that the complex was connected with athletic activities also in later times.

type in the form of a peristyle building which emerged in the archaeological record during the last 3rd of the 4th century BC.


The palaestra and the gymnasium are not the earliest 'gymnasial buildings' in Olympia. Already during the 2nd half of the 4th century BC not only there but also as in Nemea and Epidauros buildings appeared which Miller named as "stadium-tunnel-locker-complexes". Furthermore, there have been athlete baths which belonged functionally to these complexes too. The erection of such gymnasial buildings in sanctuaries in the Peloponnese took place roughly in the same period as the earliest palaestras emerged in the Greek world, and can be seen as a result of experimenting, like Miller does in relation to the free-standing athlete baths in Nemea and Epidauros.⁵¹

With the Echo stoa in Olympia there is further opportunity for interpretation of these gymnasial buildings in sanctuaries: Whilst Miller focused his considerations on the "stadium-tunnel-locker-complex", he neglected the Echo stoa as a part of the building complex between Altis and stadium. The Echo stoa was erected exactly in the area which Xenophon described as the wrestling place in 364 BC. It connected spatially and functionally the wrestling place on the Altis with the stadium and provided as a multifunctional building space for audience, exercise and body care like the later palaestra in the northwest of the precinct did. Before this background gymnasial buildings in sanctuaries and in particular the building complex of the Echo stoa in Olympia might reflect the appearance of early palaestras before the building type adopted the peristyle as an obligatory architectural form in the thirties of the 4th century BC.

⁵¹ Miller 1992, 244–250.



Pl. 1 The building-complex around the Echo-stoa in Olympia. Black = first building phase in the 2nd half of the 4th c. BC; red = Monuments erected in the front of the unfinished stoa and Hellenistic modifications; green = completion of the Echo-stoa in Augustan time and later.



Pl. 2 Olympia, Sanctuary of Zeus.

Bibliography

- Adler, Curtius, and Dörpfeld 1892
Friedrich Adler, Ernst Curtius, and Wilhelm Dörpfeld.
Olympia II. Die Baudenkmäler von Olympia. Berlin: Asher, 1892.
- Aslanidis and Pinatsi 1999
Klimis Aslanidis and Christina Pinatsi. “Τα ελληνικά λουτρα”.
In *Το Ασκληπιείο της Επιδαύρου: η έδρα του θεού γιατρού της αρχαιότητας, η συντήρηση των μνημείων*. Ed. by V. K. Lampri-
noudakis. Marousi: Periphoreia Peloponnesou, 1999, 51–52.
- Delorme 1960
Jean Delorme. *Gymnasion. Études sur les monuments consacrés
à l’éducation en Grèce des origines à l’Empire romain*. Paris: De
Boccard, 1960.
- Dittenberger and Purgold 1896
Wilhelm Dittenberger and Karl Purgold. *Die Inschriften von
Olympia*. Berlin: Asher, 1896.
- Emme 2013a
Burkhard Emme. “Das Märchen von den drei Märkten”. *Istan-
buler Mitteilungen* 63 (2013), 51–74.
- Emme 2013b
Burkhard Emme. *Peristyl und Polis. Entwicklung und Funktionen
öffentlicher griechischer Hofanlagen*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013.
- Engelmann 1993
Helmut Engelmann. “Zum Kaiserkult in Ephesos”. *Zeitschrift
für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 97 (1993), 279–289.
- Ferla 2005
Kleopatra Ferla. *Priene*. Hellenic Studies 5. Athens: Foundation
of the Hellenic World, 2005.
- Ginouvé 1962
René Ginouvé. *Balaneutikè. Recherches sur le bain dans l’antiquité
grecque*. Paris: De Boccard, 1962.
- Heilmeyer 1984
Wolf-Dieter Heilmeyer. “Durchgang, Krypte, Denkmal. Zur
Geschichte des Stadioneingangs in Olympia”. *Mitteilungen
des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 99
(1984), 251–263.
- Hellner 2013
Nils Hellner. “Die Sportstätten”. In *Mythos Olympia. Kult und
Spiele*. Ed. by W.-D. Heilmeyer, N. K. Kaltsás, H.-J. Gehrke, S.
Bocher, and A.-K. Minx. Munich: Prestel, 2013, 275–281.
- Herrmann 1972
Hans-Volkmar Herrmann. *Olympia: Heiligtum und Wettkampf-
stätte*. Munich: Hirmer, 1972.
- Jannoray 1953
Jean Jannoray. *Le gymnase*. Fouilles de Delphes. Topographie et
architecture 2. Paris: De Boccard, 1953.
- Kavvadias 1900
Panagiotis Kavvadias. *Το ιερόν του Ασκληπιού εν Επιδαύρῳ και
η θεραπεία των ασθενών*. Athens: Εκ του Τυπογραφείου των
Αδελφών Περρή, 1900.
- Kavvadias 1929
Panagiotis Kavvadias. “Anaskaphai Epidaurou”. *PAE* 1925–
1926 (1929), 139–140.
- Kazakidi 2015
Natalia Kazakidi. “Ένα οικογενειακό σύνταγμα ανδριάντων
της εποχής του Κλαυδίου και το γυμνάσιο στη Σικυώνα”. In
*Κλασική παράδοση και νεωτερικά στοιχεία στην πλαστική της
Ρωμαϊκής Ελλάδας: πρακτικά Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Θεσσαλονίκη,
7–9 Μαΐου 2009*. Ed. by Th. Stephanidou-Tiveriou, P. Karanas-
tassi, and D. Damaskos. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press,
2015, 193–211.
- Koenigs 1981
Wolf Koenigs. “Stadion III und Echohalle”. In *10. Bericht über
die Ausgrabungen in Olympia*. Ed. by A. Mallwitz. Berlin: De
Gruyter, 1981, 353–369.
- Koenigs 1984
Wolf Koenigs. *Die Echohalle*. Olympische Forschungen 14.
Berlin: De Gruyter, 1984.
- Koukouli-Chrysantaki 2002
Chaido Koukouli-Chrysantaki. “Excavating Classical Am-
phipolis”. In *Excavating Classical Culture. Recent Archaeological
Discoveries in Greece*. Ed. by M. Stamatopoulou and M. Yer-
oulanou. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2002, 57–73.
- Krischen 1925
Fritz Krischen. “Das hellenistische Gymnasion von
Priene”. *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 38/39
(1925), 133–150.
- Kunze and Schleif 1938
Emil Kunze and Hans Schleif. 2. *Bericht über die Ausgrabungen
in Olympia. Winter 1937/1938*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1938.
- Lazaridis 1990
Dimitris Lazaridis. “Το γυμνασιο τεις Αμφιπολεις”. In *Πόλις
και χώρα στην αρχαία Μακεδονία και Θράκη. Μνήμη Δ. Λαζα-
ρίδη: Πρακτικά Αρχαιολογικού Συνεδρίου, Καβάλα 9–11 Μαΐου
1986*. Thessaloniki: Hypourgeio Politismou, 1990, 241–263.
- Leybold 2008
Christina Leybold. *Bankettgebäude in griechischen Heiligtümern*.
Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2008.
- Mallwitz 1967
Alfred Mallwitz. “Das Stadion”. In *8. Bericht über die Ausgrabun-
gen von Olympia, Herbst 1958 – Sommer 1962*. Ed. by E. Kunze.
Berlin: De Gruyter, 1967, 16–82.
- Mango 2003
Elena Mango. *Das Gymnasion*. Eretria 13. Gollion: Infolio Édi-
tions, 2003.

Mango 2004

Elena Mango. "Bankette in hellenistischen Gymnasien". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel 8. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 273–311.

Miller 1992

Stephen G. Miller. "The Bath". In *Topographical and Architectural Studies: the Sacred Square, the Bath and the Xenon*. Ed. by S. G. Miller. Excavations at Nemea 1. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992, 188–261.

Miller 1990

Steven G. Miller. *Nemea. A Guide to the Site and Museum*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Miller 2001

Steven G. Miller. *The Early Hellenistic stadium*. Excavations at Nemea 2. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Morricone 1950

Luigi Morricone. "Scavi i ricerche a Co". *Bollettino d'Arte* 35 (1950), 219–246.

Patrucco 1976

Roberto Patrucco. *Lo Stadio di Epidauro*. Studi – Accademia toscana di scienze e lettere La Colombaria 44. Florence: L. S. Olschki, 1976.

Reber 2014

Karl et al. Reber. "Aktivitäten der schweizerischen Archäologischen Schule in Griechenland 2013". *Antike Kunst* 57 (2014), 114–142.

Ringel, Siewert, and Tacuber 1999

Erwin Ringel, Peter Siewert, and Hans Tacuber. "Die Symmachien Pisas mit den Arkadern, Akroreia, Messenien und Sikyon. Ein neues Fragment der arkadischen Bündnisstele von 365 v.Chr." In *11. Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia. Frühjahr 1977 – Herbst 1981*. Ed. by A. Mallwitz. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1999, 413–420.

Rocco 1997

Giorgio Rocco. "Il 'Ginnasio Occidentale'". In *La Presenza italiana nel dodecaneso tra il 1912 e il 1948*. Ed. by M. Livadiotti and G. Rocco. Athens: Edizioni del Prisma, 1997, 144–148.

Roux 1961

Georges Roux. *L'Architecture d'Argolide aux IVe et IIe siècles av. J.-C.* Paris: De Boccard, 1961.

Rumscheid 1998

Frank Rumscheid. *Priene. Führer durch das 'Pompeji Kleinasien'*. Istanbul: Ege Yayinlari, 1998.

Schede 1934

Martin Schede. *Die Ruinen von Priene*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1934.

Schilbach 1984

Jürgen Schilbach. "Untersuchungen der Schatzhausterrasse südlich des Schatzhauses der Sikyonier in Olympia". *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 1984 (1984), 225–236.

Schilbach 1992

Jürgen Schilbach. "Olympia. Die Entwicklungsphasen des Stadiions". In *Πρακτικά Συμποσίου Ολυμπιακών Αγώνων, [Αθήνα] 5–9 Σεπτεμβρίου 1988*. Ed. by W. Coulson and H. Kyrieleis. Athens: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, 1992, 33–37.

Sinn 1995

Ulrich Sinn. "Bericht über das Forschungsprojekt 'Olympia während der römischen Kaiserzeit und in der Spätantike'". *Nikephoros* 7.1994 (1995), 229–250.

Sinn 1996

Ulrich Sinn. *Olympia: Kult, Sport und Feste in der Antike*. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1996.

Thür 2007

Hilke Thür. "Das Gymnasium an der oberen Agora in Ephesos". In *Πότνια Θηρών: Festschrift für Gerda Schwarz zum 65. Geburtstag*. Ed. by E. Christof and G. Schwarz. Vienna: Phoibos, 2007.

Tomlinson 1983

Richard A. Tomlinson. *Epidauros*. Archaeological Sites. London: University of Michigan, 1983.

Travlos 1971

John Travlos. *Bildlexikon zur Topographie des antiken Athen*. Tübingen: Wasmuth, 1971.

Trombetti 2012

Catia Trombetti. "Gymnasien als sozialer Raum der Polis. Der Fall Athen". In *Orte des Geschehens. Interaktionsräume als konstitutive Elemente der antiken Stadt*. Ed. by C. Rödel-Braune and C. Waschke. Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2012, 328–354.

Trombetti 2013

Catia Trombetti. *Il ginnasio greco. Genesi, topografia e culti dei luoghi della paideia*. BAR International Series 2527. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2013.

Trümper 2008

Monika Trümper. *Die 'Agora des Italiens' in Delos: Baugeschichte, Architektur, Ausstattung und Funktion einer späthellenistischen Porticus-Anlage*. Internationale Archäologie 104. Rahden/Westf.: Marie Leidorf, 2008.

Trümper 2014

Monika Trümper. "„Privat“ versus „öffentlich“ in hellenistischen Bädern". In *Stadtkultur im Hellenismus*. Ed. by A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann. Hellenistische Polis als Lebensform 4. Mainz: Verlag Antike, 2014, 206–249.

Trümper 2015

Monika Trümper. "Modernization and Change of Function of Hellenistic Gymnasia in the Imperial Period: Case-Studies Pergamon, Miletus and Priene". In *Das kaiserzeitliche Gymnasium*. Ed. by P. Scholz and D. Wiegandt. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015, 167–222.

Wacker 1996

Christian Wacker. *Das Gymnasium in Olympia: Geschichte und Funktion*. Würzburger Forschungen zur Altertumskunde 2. Würzburg: Ergon-Verlag, 1996.

Wassenhoven 2012

Maria-Evdokia Wassenhoven. *The Bath in Greece in Classical Antiquity: the Peloponnese*. BAR International Series 2368. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2012.

Wiegand and Schrader 1904

Theodor Wiegand and Hans Schrader. *Priene: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen in den Jahren 1895–1898*. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1904.

Illustration and plate credits

ILLUSTRATIONS: 1 U. Mania after Miller 2001, fig. 10; Roux 1961, fig. 26; Kavvadias 1900, folding map. 2 Koenigs 1984, fig. 77, modified. 3 Courtesy of the photo archive of the DAI Athens, D-DAI-ATH-2015-00061. 4 Courtesy of the photo archive of the DAI Athens, D-DAI-ATH-2015-00292..
PLATES: 1 U. Mania after Adler, Curtius, and Dörpfeld 1892, pl. 4; Koenigs 1984, fig. 79. 2 Adler, Curtius, and Dörpfeld 1892, pl. 4, modified.

ULRICH MANIA

Dr. phil. (Halle 2005), studied Classical Archaeology and History of Art at the University of Halle. His published dissertation deals with the sculpture and functional installations of the Red Hall in Pergamon. He was a team member of the excavations in Pergamon and Priene for many years, and Assistant Professor at the universities of Kiel and Bonn. After a three years stay as academic visitor at the University of Oxford he became research associate of the German Archaeological Institute Istanbul in May 2016.

Dr. Ulrich Mania
 German Archaeological Institute
 İnönü Cad. 10
 34437 İstanbul – Gümüßsuyu, Turkey
 E-Mail: ulrich.mania@dainst.de

Ada Caruso

A New Athenian Gymnasium from the 4th Century BC?

Summary

Literary sources attest that the gymnasium of the Athenian Academy was used from the 6th century BC to at least the 2nd century AD. The site, located based on texts and a horos stone, has been variously explored since 1929. Of the excavated structures, a rectangular courtyard building in the South has commonly been identified as the palaestra of the Academy gymnasium, whereas a large square peristyle building (so-called Tetragonos Peristylos) in the North has received little attention. This paper critically revises the identification of these two buildings and argues that the southern building, whose courtyard belongs to the Late Antique period, cannot have functioned as a palaestra. Instead, the square peristyle building, which was surrounded by rooms and dates to the 4th century BC, should be identified as a palaestra, due the plan and epigraphic evidence.

Keywords: Athens; Academy; gymnasium; palaestra; Tetragonos Peristyle

Schriftquellen belegen, dass das Gymnasium der Athener Akademie vom 6. Jh. v. Chr. bis mindestens zum 2. Jh. n. Chr. benutzt wurde. Der Ort wurde anhand von Texten und einem Horosstein lokalisiert und seit 1929 mehrfach untersucht. Zu den freigelegten Strukturen gehören im Süden ein rechteckiger Bau mit Hof, der als Palaestra der Akademie gedeutet wurde, und im Norden ein großer quadratischer Peristylbau, der wenig beachtet wurde. Dieser Beitrag revidiert die Identifizie-

rung der beiden Bauten. Es wird gezeigt, dass der Hof des südlichen Baus in die Spätantike gehört und nicht als Palaestra fungiert haben kann. Stattdessen ist der quadratische Bau, dessen Peristyl von Räumen umgeben und der ins 4. Jh. v. Chr. zu datieren ist, anhand von Plan und Inschriften als Palaestra zu identifizieren.

Keywords: Athen; Akademie; Gymnasium; Palästra; Tetragonos Peristylos

For the accomplishment of this study many thanks are due to: Prof. Emanuele Greco, former Director of the Italian Archaeological School of Athens, who supported it, as well as Prof. Panos Dimas (Norwegian Institute of Athens); Dr. Aris Koronakis, Effie Lygkouri Tolia, Effie Baziotopoulou-Valavani, and Dr. Manolis Panayotopoulou (Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens) for their kind assistance and the discussions on the topography of the Academy; the Archaialogiki Etairia, for the permission to read the notebooks of Ph. Stravopoulos, and the Akadimia Athinon, for the permission to access P.Z. Aristophron's reports and for the kind help in reading them. I would like to extend my gratitude to the late Prof. Enzo Lipolis (Sapienza University of Rome), for his advice during our visit to the site, which I will keep forever in my memory, and to Prof. Fausto Longo (University of Salerno). Finally, I am grateful to Paul Beston for the revision of my English.

The Academy, named for the hero Akademos (also Ἐκάδεμος), who first lived in the place,¹ is the north-western suburb of Athens, situated one kilometer east of the river Cephissus, and approximately one mile to the north-east of the city wall starting from the Dipylon Gate (Pl. 1). This location, initially given by the literary sources, is confirmed by a boundary marker, a Horos, which was discovered *in situ*, 116 m south-east from Aimonos and Tripoleos streets.² Here, one of the three most ancient gymnasia of Athens was located, which are attested by authors from the Archaic period onwards.

The topography of the area has been variously discussed: scholars have mostly dealt with the two main buildings,³ more occasionally with Plato's school premises⁴ or with religion-linked topographical features.⁵ My aim here is to discuss the identification of the two main buildings, the so-called gymnasium or rather palaestra of the Academy and the Tetragnon Peristylus.⁶ Since its discovery in 1929, a building on the south-eastern edge of the area has been identified as the palaestra of the Academy (Pl. 2 a). Going against the *communis opinio*, I suggest identifying the palaestra as the building lying 200 m further north, which is generally called the Tetragnon Peristylus (Pl. 2 b). My hypothesis stems from a critical approach to the architecture and building technique of the two monuments. In order to look at the problem from as complete a perspective as possible, I will undertake a brief re-examination of all of the testimonies related to the facilities in the gymnasium area.

I Chronological history of the facilities pertaining to the Gymnasium of the Academy according to the literary sources

The Academy gymnasium was in use from the Archaic period onwards, as we know from Demosthenes, who recalls a law of Solon for the protection of the three city gymnasia from thieves (the Academy, the Cynosarges and the Lykeion).⁷ Shortly afterwards, in the Peisistratid age, Charmos, Peisistratus' *eromenos*, dedicated an altar to Eros, as Athenaeus tells us.⁸ Athenaeus's testimony, containing the expression ἐπὶ τέρμασι γυμνασίου, is very interesting for our topographical analysis, as the term τέρμα, (-ατος, τό), means: "end, boundary, limit", but also: "goal round which men, horses and chariots had to turn at races".⁹ This last meaning would lead us to conclude that in the 6th century BC the gymnasium of the Academy was provided with a running track.¹⁰

Shortly after the dedication by Charmos, Hipparchus, Peisistratus's son, wanted to build a *peribolos* wall in order to protect the place.¹¹ All the testimonies noted here imply that the 6th century BC Athenian ruling class paid great attention to the Academy gymnasium, a sign that the nascent institution was already conceived of as fundamental to civic life. It must be said that when we think of the gymnasium of the Academy in the Archaic age, we must not imagine any specific buildings, but rather a large area, within which premises were disparate and unconnected. To summarize, they presumably were:

1 Scol. ad Arist. Nu. 1005a; Hsch. s.v. Ἀκαδήμια. Likewise Ἐκάδεμος, the form Ἐκαδεμείας is also attested in the source beside Ἀκαδεμείας; cfr. Morison 1988, 178–183.

2 Alexandri 1968, 102–102; Travlos 1971, 42, figs. 56–57; Ritchie 1984, 10–14 and 709–711; Morison 1988, 16–20.

3 On the topography of the Academy (in chronological order): Leake 1829; Dyer 1873, 486–492; Wachsmuth 1874, 268–271; Curtius and Kaupert 1881, 7; Wachsmuth 1894; Natorp 1894; Judeich 1931, 412–414; Wycheley 1962, 2–10; Id. 1978, 219–225; Travlos 1971, 42–52, figs. 52–54, 300–302, 417–420; Billot 1989; Wacker 1996, 145–160; Trombetti 2013, 6–13, 24–29; Caruso 2013, 48–53, 65–82, for a description of each architectural evidence recorded in the area, and 83–90 for a detailed and updated reading of the evidence.

4 Caruso 2013, 31–117 with bibliography.

5 Billot 1989; Marchiandi 2003, in particular for the Archaic period; Caruso 2013, 38–42, for the cult of the Muses.

6 In accordance with common practice in scholarship, a building with a central peristyle courtyard is called palaestra here, whereas a gymnasium includes different features, such as a palaestra and running tracks (xystos, paradromis). Therefore, the Academy is referred to as a gymnasium, but single peristyle buildings within the area of the Academy are referred to

as palaestrae; for a detailed discussion of palaestrae, see B. Emme in this volume.

7 Demos. XXIX 114: "Καὶ εἴ τις Λυκείου ἢ ἐξ Ἀκαδημείας ἢ ἐκ Κυνοσαργύρου ἱμάτιον ἢ ληκύθιον ἢ ἄλλοτι φαυλότατον, ἢ εἰ τῶν σκευῶν τι τῶν ἐκ τῶν γυμνασίων ὑφέλοιτο ἢ ἐκ τῶν λυμένων, ὑπὲρ δὲ καθραχμάς, καὶ τοῦτοις θάνατον ἐνομοθέτησεν εἶναι τὴν ζημίαν." On this law see: Jüthner 1965, 79–81; Glucker 1978, 243 n. 68; Billot 1989, 705.

8 Ath. XIII 609c–d (XIII, 89): Ποικιλομήχαν Ἐρως, σοὶ τόνδ' ἰδρύσατο βωμόν / Χάρμος ἐπὶ σκιεροῖς τέρμασι γυμνασίου. English translation (Yonge 1853–1854): O wily Love, Charmus this altar raised / At the well-shaded bounds of her Gymnasium. – The dedication of the altar by Charmos is also attested by Paus. I 30, 1; Apul. Plat. I 1; Clem. Al. Protr. III 44.2.5.

9 TLG s.v. τέρμα.

10 This is quite plausible, as running was the most ancient competition held during athletic games, and the only one disputed in the initial stages of Pan-Hellenic festivals.

11 Suid. s.v. Τὸ Ἰππάρχου τεῖχος: Ἰππάρχος ὁ Πεισιστράτου περὶ τὴν Ἀκαδημίαν τεῖχος ὠκοδόμησε, πολλὰ ἀναγκάσας ἀναλώσαι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους. Ὅθεν καὶ ἐπὶ δαπανηρῶν πραγμάτων ἡπαρομία εἶρεται.

- the *dromos*, with its *terma*, for running races
- a *peribolos* wall, built by Hipparchos, Peisistratos's son
- altars, such as that of Eros mentioned by Athenaeus
- a building to which 6th century BC terracotta antefixes and painted metopes discovered in the site belonged.¹²

Literary sources attest that in the 5th century BC the area of the Academy was provided with additional venues:

- a number of roads (*dromoi*), groves and paths for walking (*peripatoi*) during Cimon's age¹³
- tracks for chariots races, according to Xenophon¹⁴
- altars and sacred installations¹⁵
- venues for *paideia*, according to an Aristophanes comedy written around 420 BC: ἀλλ'εἰς Ἀκαδημειαν κατιῶν ὑπὸ ταῖς μορίαις ἀποθρέξει / Στεφανωσάμενος καλάμῳ λευκῷ μετὰ σῶφρονος ἡλικιώτου.¹⁶

Aristophanes does not directly mention any facility for the *paideia*, but implies to it by mentioning the κάλαμος, the normal writing implement, and training in racing (ἀποθρέχω) among the activities of two young boys. Notably, one of them is described as well-educated (σῶφρονος ἡλικιώτου). Aristophanes aside, the 5th century BC educational activity in the Academy is also attested by about a hundred schist tablets carrying names of gods (e.g. Athena, Ares) and famous men (Aristides,

Demosthenes), which have been regarded by some scholars as indicating the presence of a *didaskaleion* in the place.¹⁷

In the 4th century BC the Academy is firmly connected with Plato's philosophical school, once he started teaching in the gymnasium's confines in 387 BC on his return from Italy.¹⁸ The main source is Diogenes Laertius,¹⁹ but many other authors attest the presence of the philosopher, whose school was actually called 'Academia'.²⁰ If the use of gymnasia for philosophical lessons was a custom in Athens (e.g.: Socrates and Aristotle in the Lykeion; Antisthenes in the Cynosarges), Plato's teaching must imply that at this period the gymnasium of the Academy was provided with rooms and all the other venues suitable for performing lessons, even if they are not explicitly attested.

Sources attest instead that in the 4th century the gymnasium of the Academy was provided with a palaestra. In a discourse of 324 BC, Hyperides recalls the *epistates* of the Academy, Aristomachos, being accused of having moved a vane from the palaestra of the Academy to his own garden.²¹

Training facilities in the Academy were used at least down to the early 2nd century BC, as an inscription dated to 184–171 BC clearly attests:²²

ἐφ'ἡβο[υς - - - | - - - ἐν Ἀκ]αδημείαι γυμν[άζοντας - - - (Il. 4–5).

Unfortunately, this is the last mention of activity in the gymnasium before Pausanias' visit in the 2nd century AD.²³ It is possible that during his siege of Athens, in 87–86 BC, Sulla occupied and destroyed the site when he wanted to cut the trees in the Academy grove with the aim of building war machines.²⁴

12 Karo 1933, col. 210; Karo 1934, coll. 139–140; Stavropoulos 1969, 343; Travlos 1971, 43, figs. 54, 55, and 62.

13 Plu. *Cim.* XIII 7–8.

14 X. Eq. Mag. III 14: Ὅταν ἐν τῷ ἐπικρότῳ ἐν Ἀκαδημίᾳ ἱππεύειν δέη. On the chariots races held on the *dromos* of the Academy see also Ael. VH II 27.

15 Two *scolia* to Sophocles attest these; one (Schol. OC 56) refers to a sculptured basis near the entrance (on which Prometheus, seated and holding a sceptre, was represented with Hephaestus standing close to an altar); the other (Schol. OC 705) a *ιερόν* of Athena and an altar of Zeus *Kataibates*: "περὶ Ἀκαδημίας ἐστὶν ὃ τε τοῦ Καταιβάτου Διὸς βωμός, ὃν καὶ Μόριον καλοῦσι, τῶν ἐκεῖ μορίων παρὰ τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερόν ἰδρυμένων."

16 Ar. Nu. 1005–1006.

17 Stavropoulos 1958, 12–13, pls. 12–14; Daux 1960, 644–646, fig. 1; SEG XIX, 37; Vanderpool 1959, 279–280; Duhoux 1987, fasc. 1–2–3, 189–192; Balatsos 1991. Against this hypothesis: Morison 1988, 110–122; Lynch 1984, 119–120; Threath 2007, 129–135.

18 Plato's reasons for why Plato started teaching in the Academy are discussed in Caruso 2013, 32–37.

19 Diog. Laert. III 7: Ἐπανελθὼν δὲ εἰς Ἀθήνας διέτριβεν ἐν Ἀκαδημίᾳ. Τὸ δ' ἐστὶ γυμνάσιον προάσκειον ἀλσώδες, ἀπὸ τίνος ἥρωος ὀνομασθὲν Ἑκαδήμου.

20 Epikrates (= Ath. II 59d), l. 11 in particular; Plut. *Exil.* 603b–c; Hieronym. *Adv. Iovin.* II 9.338 a–b; Porph. *abst.* I 36; Olymp. *In Alcib.* II 145–146; Cic. *Acad.* I.IV.17; Diog. L. III 41.

21 Hyper. *Dem.* V 26.

22 Reinmuth 1961, 15–17 n. 9 pl. 3. It is a decree honouring a *kosmetes*.

23 Equally, no mention of the gymnasium of the Academy occurs in Strabo, who merely includes the Academy among the richest places of history and myth (Strabo IX 1.17).

24 Plut. *Sull.* XII 4. Perhaps it is for the same reasons that Platonic philosophers disappeared from the area, as the last scholar, Philo of Larissa, moved to Rome in 86 BC, precisely during the Mithridatic war (Cic. *Brut.* LXXXIX 306).

As said, for the imperial age, the main source is Pausanias. The traveler, who arrived at the site from the Dipylon Gate, provides a description only of the altars (*bomoi*), which he describes in sequence, starting from the outermost to the innermost.²⁵ The gymnasium he simply mentions:

Outside the city, too, in the parishes and on the roads, the Athenians have sanctuaries of the gods, and graves of heroes and of men. The nearest is the Academy, once the property of a private individual, but in my time a gymnasium.²⁶

After Pausanias, we are in the dark regarding the gymnasium of the Academy. The unhealthy character of the site (which is often mentioned by ancient authors),²⁷ and the general decline of the institution of the gymnasium led to the abandonment of the area, which was neglected at least until the 4th–5th centuries AD. In fact, sources do not mention the Academy until Proclus' age.²⁸

2 Discovery and interpretation of the main buildings of the Academy

Systematic excavation of the site began in 1929, through the initiative and enthusiasm of the architect Panayotis Z. Aristophron. Under the patronage of the *Akadimia Athinon*,²⁹ and with the aim to revive ancient Plato's philosophical school,³⁰ Aristophron not only financed

the excavations at his own expense,³¹ but also provided annual reports, which are central to the topographic reconstruction of the Academy.³²

After locating the area of the Academy along the Demosion Sema,³³ the excavators found large limestone foundation blocks at the intersection between the modern streets of Alexandreias and Maratonomachon, just north of the Church of Haghiios Tryphon. These belonged to a large-scale building, with a big rectangular courtyard surrounded by porticoes on three sides. Several factors persuaded Aristophron that this was the gymnasium (or rather palaestra) of the Academy:³⁴ a) the plan; b) the position; c) the roughly 1500 m distance from the Dipylon Gate, which matched Livy's testimony³⁵ of one thousand Roman *passus* between the two places; d) the vicinity to a Roman bath complex lying in the south-east, a pattern which occurs in several gymnasia all over the Greek world; e) the presence of nine tombs along the east side of the building, which were supposed to be those of *agonothetai*.³⁶ This interpretation was reinforced by the discovery in the same area of the remains of a wall (identified as a retaining wall, *analemma*), and of a long portion of beaten earth. Because of the proximity to the building regarded as the palaestra, both were regarded as traces of the *stadion*.³⁷

In 1933, further to the north-east of the so-called gymnasium (palaestra), archaeologists found large foundation blocks pertaining to a building with a peristyle courtyard. Only Aristophron, hugely enthusiastic, interpreted it as Plato's philosophical school,³⁸ while

25 Paus. I 29.5 and I 30.2–4. The first of them, exactly in front of the entrance, was dedicated to Eros (“πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἐσόδου τῆς ἐς Ἀκαδημίαν ἐστὶ βωμὸς Ἐρωτος ἔχων ἐπίγραμμαὶς Χάρμος Ἀθηναίων πρῶτος Ἐρωτὶ ἀναθεῖναι”), the following were those of Prometheus, the Muses and Hermes, Athena, Herakles, Zeus. For a detailed discussion on the cults of the Academy see Billot 1989, 748–790.

26 Jones 1918. Original text: Ἀθηναῖοις δὲ καὶ ἔξω πόλεως ἐν τοῖς δῆμοις καὶ κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς θεῶν ἐστινιερὰ καὶ ἡρώων καὶ ἀνδρῶν τάφοι: ἐγγυτάτῳ δὲ Ἀκαδημία, χωρίον ποτὲ ἀνδρὸς ἰδιώτου, γυμνάσιον δὲ ἐμοῦ (Paus. I 29.2.).

27 Ael. VH IX 10, 2; Porph. *Abst.* I 36: But Plato chose to reside in the Academy, a place not only solitary and remote from the city, but which was also said to be insalubrious (English translation: Taylor 1823).

28 For further details, see Caruso 2013, 121–126, 152–153.

29 The *Akadimia Athinon* is an independent institution founded in 1926 with the attempt of promoting scientific studies. Aims and objectives are listed in PAA (Πρακτικά της Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν) I, 1926, 3–4.

30 Aristophron 1938a.

31 For the annual amount of his donations see: PAA (Πρακτικά της Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν) 4, 1929, 98; 5, 1930, 75; 7, 1932, 65; 8, 1933, 335; 11, 1936, 270.

32 Aristophron's reports quoted in this text are available in the archive of the *Akadimia Athinon* and in the above mentioned PAA volumes.

33 For the history of excavations in the years 1929–1940 see Murray 2006 and, more shortly, Papayannopoulos-Palaos 1952–1953, 74–78.

34 Aristophron 1933a, 245: according to the terminology used here, this is a palaestra building.

35 Liv. XXXI 24.9: limes mille ferme passus longus, in Academiae gymnasium ferens (the road, about 1000 passus long, leading to the gymnasium of the Academy). The Roman *passus* (5 feet) is 1.48 m; one thousand *passus* are therefore 1480 m.

36 Aristophron 1933b, 71; Aristophron 1933c, 2.

37 Aristophron 1938b, 1–2; Aristophron 1939, 3–4; PAA (Πρακτικά της Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν) 13, 1938, 794. In Aristophron's reports the *stadion* is sometimes defined with the generic term ἐπικροτός: 'beaten earth' (Cfr. TLG III, coll. 1657–1658). For an exhaustive description of the excavations in the years 1924–1937 see Murray 2006, 246–250; for the following years, till 2011, see Caruso 2013, 53–58.

38 Aristophron 1938a, 82; Aristophron 1937, 82: “The holy place have I discovered. O Academy, even thine Ambulatory! Yea, I have discovered thee. O place of initiation into the Academic mysteries, treasure-trove of this

others generically called it Τετράγωνος Περίστυλος because of its square plan.³⁹ In the vicinity, sporadic finds from the Archaic period were brought to light: terracotta antefixes; fragments of tiles and a fragment of a painted metope, with the scene of a man holding a hare.⁴⁰ Recently, D. Marchiandi, after an astute analysis, has interpreted the metope as an iconographic testimony of the Archaic gymnasium. In particular, she has connected the scene of the man with his prey to the sphere of homosexual love, which was no stranger to the aristocratic world of Archaic *ephebeia*.⁴¹

After the Second World War and Aristophron's death in 1945, excavations were undertaken by Ph. Stavropoulos (1955–1963). He returned to the so-called gymnasium building and discovered two small masonry buildings: one, quadrangular in plan, in the middle of the courtyard, and another, rectangular, along its northern edge.⁴²

These were the last excavations carried out on the site; all subsequent actions were sporadic surveys or consolidation works, such as the recent cleaning work undertaken in the summer of 2011. In 1993 the area became a public park, after the expropriation and demolition of hundreds of houses all around.⁴³

3 Towards a new interpretation

Before moving to a new interpretation, it must be said that our knowledge of the site is still partial because fieldwork was not always done in a systematic way; furthermore, research was hampered by the frequent flooding of the Cephissus, which caused alluvial deposits of about 6 m thickness.⁴⁴ Furthermore, the publication of data was not always timely and most of the materials and plans are still unpublished. Clay mining, begun in 1952,⁴⁵ and local urban growth were further causes of data loss. For all these reasons every interpretation of the ruins, previous and new, must be considered as hypo-



Fig. 1 Athens, Academy, so-called gymnasium: sequence of bases inside the west side.

thetical and not exhaustive. Nevertheless, I think that it is possible to look at the two main monuments of the area, the so-called gymnasium and the Tetragonos Peristylus, with a more critical approach.

3.1 The so-called gymnasium of the Academy

As said, from its discovery in 1929, the gymnasium (or rather palaestra) of the Academy was identified by Aristophron with the building on the south-eastern edge of the area (Pl. 2: building a). Aristophron's interpretation was soon broadly accepted⁴⁶ and became standard in archaeological literature.⁴⁷

The building follows a rectangular plan, contains rooms on the northern side and a big rectangular courtyard (44.4×23.4 m), surrounded by three corridors on the east, west and south sides. Inside each corridor, square bases are situated at a distance of 2.5 m from each other (Fig. 1). On the north, foundations of a portico stand in front of the rooms; behind the portico, rectangular masonry marks the courtyard's northern side. In Aristophron's view, the square bases along the long sides would indicate a peristyle, with the *palaestra* in the inner space⁴⁸ while the rooms behind the peristyle (no longer

day of marvel! I have found thee. O venerable Sanctuary of Intelligence and Knowledge, Freedom and Stronghold, Spiritual Health and Eternal Fatherland of all inquiring souls! I recognize thee by every token, by every influence, as though I had passed my life without intermission lapped on thy bosom."

39 Aristophron 1933b, 71.

40 Karo 1933, col. 210; Karo 1934, coll. 139–140.

41 Marchiandi 2003, 28–32 figs. 8–10.

42 Stavropoulos 1963.

43 Lygkouri-Tolia 1993 [1998], B1, 61.

44 Stavropoulos 1963, 6 fig. 1.

45 Orlandos 1956, 15.

46 Keramopoulos 1933, 247; Karo 1933, coll. 208–209; Béguignon 1933, 250–251; Blegen 1933, 491; Lemerle 1935, 251.

47 Delorme 1960, 38; Wycherley 1962, 8; Travlos 1960, 134; Travlos 1971, 42–43 figs. 59–61; von Hesberg 1995, 17 fig. 5; Wacker 1996, 154; Lygouri 2002, 209; Trombetti 2013, 27–28.

48 Aristophron 1933c, 1.



Fig. 2 Athens, Academy, so-called gymnasium: marks of double-T clamps on reused blocks.



Fig. 3 Athens, Academy, so-called gymnasium: anathyrosis marks on the reused blocks of the *oikos*.

recognizable) would be *exedrae*.⁴⁹ The building has been variously dated over the years: from the Archaic age⁵⁰ to Late Antiquity,⁵¹ when, at the beginning of the 5th century AD, it would have been rebuilt *ex fundamentis*, according to some scholars.⁵²

After examining anew all of the data (archaeological reports, sources and materials) and comparing the building with other palaestrae all over the Greek world, I do not believe it is a palaestra.⁵³ Some of the reasons why the building cannot work as a palaestra are evident. First, there are very few rooms, and none of them is typical for the two main activities undertaken inside gymnasia, athletics and teaching; which room would be, for example, the *exedra*? And which room would have been the *sphaisterion* or the *loutron*? Second, the disposition of the rooms on the northern side is not comparable to that of other palaestrae. Third, the peculiar rectangular plan is not very common among palaestrae, at least in the eastern Mediterranean world.⁵⁴

Apart from these general arguments, the main difficulties for the interpretation of the building in the Academy concern:

a) the plan, which does not show the characteristics

of a palaestra;

b) the lack of any evidence (inscriptions or other finds) that could attest its function as part of a gymnasium.

Thus, at the moment it is quite difficult to explain why and how the building was originally built and subsequently restored. In order to avoid any further misinterpretation, we must reconstruct, as far as possible, the building phases. Through autopsy, I have recognized four (Pl. 3)

- Phase 1: an unknown building, of which only architectural members survived in the second phase building.
- Phase 2: a rectangular *oikos* in the north (8.8 × 13.6 m). It consists entirely of soft white limestone blocks, reused from the first phase of the building (Pl. 3 a). This reused material dates to the Archaic or Classical periods, as indicated by double-T clamps and *anathyrosis* marks (Figs. 2, 3).⁵⁵ In the same period, or shortly afterwards, a six-columned portico was constructed 4.5 m south of the *oikos*.

49 Aristophron 1933a, 245: “εἰς τὰς πλευρὰς τῶν ὁποίων διακρίνονται τὰ διάφορα διαμερίσματα, αἱ ἐξεδραὶ λεγόμεναι” (εἰκ. 4).

50 Karo 1934, coll. 136–130; Blegen 1934, 602; Payne 1934, 188.

51 Travlos 1960, 134: the architect dated the building on the basis of the planimetric similarity with the ‘Palace of the Giants’ in the agora, and considered the building in the Academy “ἀνικοδομήθη ἐκ βάρων κατὰ τὰς ἀρχὰς τοῦ 500 μ.Χ. αἰῶνος”.

52 Aristophron 1933a, 245–247; Karo 1933; Stavropoulos 1963; Wycherley 1962, 8; Wycherley 1978, 222; Lynch 1972, 187, n. 24; Ritchie 1984, 696.

53 For a full discussion of my thesis see Caruso 2013, 90–96.

54 While some buildings with similar rectangular plans have been identified as palaestrae in literature, such as the so-called Hellenistic gymnasium in Miletus, this interpretation has recently been challenged; for such ‘false’ palaestrae see in detail B. Emme in this volume. Confer, however, the safely identified palaestra in Solunto, which has a rectangular plan with a rectangular peristyle courtyard; see M. Trümper in this volume.

55 Orlandos 1968, vol. II, 99–100 and 106–107; Lippolis, Livadiotti, and Rocco 2007, 902–903.

Foundations for column bases (1.28×1.1 m with a distance of 2 m) are still visible (Fig. 4).

- Phase 3: enlargement of the *oikos*. Three rooms were constructed from reused conglomerate blocks on the eastern side of the *oikos*, at a higher level (Pl. 3 b). While there is no evidence, a similar arrangement may have existed on the western side. The previous *oikos* was demolished, and a larger room created in its place. Perhaps at this stage, the facing portico was covered with large conglomerate blocks (Fig. 5), probably in order to convert it into a long basement.
- Phase 4: the building achieved its monumental form (Pl. 3 c). A big rectangular courtyard (44.4×23.4 m) was created by adding corridors on three sides with foundations of small blocks and mortar, in a typical Late Antique manner (Fig. 6).

The corridors in the east, west and south of the courtyard with width of 5.40 m each are characterized by a sequence of square bases (0.72×0.72 m) at a distance of 2.75 m from each other (Fig. 1). Perhaps at this stage (judging by the building technique), a rectangular basin with a length of 11.5 m was created along the northern edge of the court.⁵⁶ It was built with blocks of *poros* and abundant mortar. Traces of a waterproof plaster are still visible.⁵⁷ A second square basin (7.6×13 m) was erected in the middle of the courtyard with a pavement of bricks, similar to that of the northern rectangular basin.⁵⁸ Like the northern basin, the central basin may have been used as a fountain, as it is connected to a tiled water duct coming from north-west.⁵⁹

The two basins and the courtyard foundations are set into virgin soil which does not give a hint for any previous buildings in this area.⁶⁰ Thus, according to the building technique and to the ceramic finds in the area, the courtyard was not made before the Late Roman period (4th–5th centuries AD).

Only at this time the building achieved the plan with courtyard that resembles a palaestra. But at this

time, gymnasia no longer existed in Athens, as evidenced by the fact that the last references to *paidotribes* and *kosmetes* from Athens come from inscriptions dated to AD 263 or 267.⁶¹ After this date, the Athenian *ephebeia* seems to have disappeared and gymnasia were not mentioned anymore in the sources.⁶² According to this reconstruction, one has to conclude that this building was never a palaestra of a gymnasium.

3.2 The Tetragonos Peristylus

In my opinion, a better candidate for a palaestra may be the so-called Tetragonos Peristylus, which is located 220 m farther to the north-east, in the block of the Monasteriou, Eukleidou, Tripoleos and Platonos streets (Pl. 2 b).⁶³ Remains of the northern, western and southern sides of this building survived. On the northern side, foundations with a length of 14 m were discovered: they are made of limestone and large conglomerate blocks ($1.3\text{--}1.5 \times 0.8\text{--}0.9$ m), and belong to a portico. Foundations on the western side consist of identical conglomerate blocks, belong to the same building and can be followed for a length of 21.9 m (Fig. 7). A few limestone blocks follow the orientation of the western foundations: they lie about one meter away from these foundations and probably belong to the back wall of the western portico. From the findings so far, we can assume a peristyle courtyard, with, five columns on the northern side and seven on the western side.

On the southern side of the peristyle blocks discontinuously emerge at the surface of the ground: they are made of the same material and run perfectly parallel to the northern side. All foundations together encircle a central square courtyard with a size of 40 by 40 m. In the middle of the courtyard archaeologists made a huge trench; the absence of architectural finds here confirms that this was very likely a courtyard.

While the plan of the building is not debated among scholars, its function has never been defined more closely, and the monument still appears in literature under the generic name of Tetragonos Peristylus.⁶⁴

56 Caruso 2013, 71 fig. 17.

57 Its outer walls are left un-worked and stand for 42 cm from the long side of the foundations; this means that the basin had to be embedded in the ground.

58 Caruso 2013, 72 fig. 18.

59 Caruso 2013, 72 fig. 19.

60 Lygouri 2000, 71.

61 Graindor 1922, 165–228; Geagan 1967, 1; Follet 1976, 490 and 526.

62 Oliver 1933, 507–509; Frantz 1979, 200–203 (esp. 203): “The negative evidence in this point is so weighty that it cannot be easily dismissed.”

63 For detailed discussion see Caruso 2013, 96–100.

64 Aristophron 1933b, 71; Aristophron 1933c, 2–3; Aristophron 1939, 4–5; Karo 1933, col. 210; Karo 1934, coll. 139–140; Lemerle 1935, 251;



Fig. 4 Athens, Academy, so-called gymnasium: foundations of the northern portico, view from west.



Fig. 5 Athens, Academy, so-called gymnasium: obliteration of the portico.

Only A. Papayannopoulos-Palaïos interpreted this building as the palaestra of the Academy gymnasium, but he did not provide any arguments, only general reflections on the peristyle plan.⁶⁵ In my view, there are arguments for identifying the building as the palaestra of the Academy gymnasium. This hypothesis may be confirmed by some features of the plan and two inscriptions found during excavations:

Regarding the plan, the main features of a palaestra are the square courtyard and rooms behind the porticoes. The courtyard seems to be fairly typical of palaestrae, and has parallels in several palaestrae of the late Classical and Hellenistic periods: the Lykeion in Athens, which was discovered and identified by Effie Lygouri

in 1996 in the eastern suburb of the city,⁶⁶ and the palaestrae at Amphipolis, Delphi, Eretria, Olympia and Priene.⁶⁷ In respect of the second planimetric feature, the rooms behind the peristyle, previous scholars did not recognize these rooms, and they simply labelled the building square peristyle. In my view, rooms are quite plausible, as limestone foundations were brought to light during recent excavation work in the north-eastern corner six m away from northern portico (Fig. 8).⁶⁸ In ascribing them to the building in question, it is quite significant that they are in axis with the peristyle's northern side and date to the 4th century BC, as does the rest of the building.⁶⁹

Papayannopoulos-Palaïos 1937; Delorme 1960, 38–39; Stavropoulos 1969, 342–343; Travlos 1971, 43; Chatzioti 1980, B1, 37–41 fig. 4; Touchais 1989, 587–588; Hoepfner 2002, 59; Caruso 2013, 74–75 figs. 21–23.

⁶⁵ Papayannopoulos-Palaïos 1937.

⁶⁶ Lygouri 1996, pl. 21a; Lygouri 2002.

⁶⁷ von Hesberg 1995, 17–18, figs. 4, 7, 16; Winter 2006, figs. 284–297; von den Hoff 2009; G. Ackermann and K. Reber in this volume; B. Emme in this volume.

⁶⁸ Chatzioti 1980, B1, 39–41.

⁶⁹ Another room was built in the north-western corner of the building in Late Antiquity with blocks of conglomerate and limestone reused from a previous Hellenistic room (Chatzioti 1980, B1, 39–40, fig. 2). – Another room (8.70 × 12.70 m) is recognizable in the north-western corner of the building; it has been identified as a *loutron*, albeit without providing any convincing evidence; Wacker 1996, 153; Trombetti 2013, 28–29. An alleged fountain is in reality a well with a Turkish pit; Chatzioti 1980, B1, 37–39 fig. 2. Furthermore, the room was built in Late Antiquity with



Fig. 6 Athens, Academy, so-called gymnasium: foundations on the east side of the courtyard, detail of the building material.



Fig. 7 Athens, Academy, Tetragonos Peristylus: foundation of the west portico, view from north.

The Tetragonos Peristylus is currently dated to the second half of the 4th century BC, with reference to the building technique, notably the combination of conglomerate and limestone blocks. This combination is commonly dated to the second half of the 4th century BC (e.g., north analemma of the theater of Dionysus; base of the monument of Lysikrates; proteichisma in the Kerameikos). However, this building technique was used from the first half of the 4th century BC onwards. An early example of this technique is provided by the base of Dexileos' funerary monument in the Kerameikos, where the two materials are employed together (Fig. 9). As is known from the dedicatory inscription, the monument for Dexileos was erected in 394/393 BC, after the death of the young man in the battle of Corinth. Therefore, the Tetragonos Peristyle could also have been built in the early 4th century BC, and not necessarily in the second half.

The identification of the Tetragonos Peristylus as a

palaestra and part of the gymnasium of the Academy is also supported by two inscriptions. The first is a 3rd century BC dedication to Hermes. It was found during early excavations by P. Aristophron in 1933,⁷⁰ but never given due prominence. The inscription runs along the upper section of a rectangular marble stele (1.27×0.33 m): “Θηβαῖος Λυσιάδου Ἀλοπεκήθεν Ἑρμεῖ φυλαρχήσας ἀνέθηκε” (Thebaios, Lysiades, son of the deme of Alopeke, dedicated (this) to Hermes having been φύλαρχος).⁷¹

In my opinion, this inscription is fundamental in identifying the building as a palaestra for two reasons: First, Thebaios was φύλαρχος (*phylarches*), head of the young people of his phyle, who likely trained in the gymnasium of the Academy. Second, he dedicated the monument to Hermes. The god is particularly significant for the institution of the gymnasium, as he is the divinity most intimately associated with gymnasia, along with

blocks of conglomerate and limestone reused from Classical buildings in the vicinity, and therefore cannot belong to the 4th century BC edifice; for the chronology see Chatzioti 1980, 39–41.

⁷⁰ Aristophron 1933b, 71.

⁷¹ SEG XLVII, 197; cf. Morison 1988, 191, T 35; Marchiandi 2003, 35–37.



Fig. 8 Athens, Academy, Tetragonos Peristylus, north-eastern corner: limestone foundations.




Fig. 9 Athens, Kerameikos: monument for Dexileos.

Herakles. As it is well-known, they are the two θεοὶ παλαιστρικοί.⁷²

The second inscription is a *stoichedon* decree for Demetrios Poliorcetes.⁷³ He is honored for having freed the city of Athens and all the Greeks from the threat of the Macedonians between the years 307 and 304 BC. Among the honors is a bronze statue, which was destined to be placed in the agora, next to that of Democracy, and an altar for performing annual sacrifices to Demetrios, who was called Soter (ll. 14–17). As already noticed by Antonios Kerampoullou,⁷⁴ this type of dedication was typically displayed in the most visible places in the city, such as the agora, the acropolis, the great shrines and even gymnasia, in order to inspire young people to perform worthy actions for the common good. In this respect, it is worth noting that about 70 decrees come from the excavation of the Tetragonos Peri-

stylus. Unfortunately, they are not yet published, but they are currently being studied. Their presence indicates that the building was used for the exhibition of public documents.

4 Conclusion

A full revision of both the monuments allows for a new interpretation. As I have demonstrated, there are reasons for interpreting the Tetragonos Peristylus as the palaestra of the Academy. Regarding the building to the south-east, the so-called gymnasium, both its dating and interpretation need revision. Its plan differs significantly from that of typical palaestrae, and it presents several building phases, none of which resembles those of known palaestrae. The final plan, including the court-

72 Delorme 1960, 339–340; Johnston 2003, 161–163 (Hermes *Agonios*); Jailard 2007, 195–196; Trombetti 2006, 49–53; Vernant 1974, 158. See also Ath. XIII 561d–e: δῆλον ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ τὰ γυμνάσια αὐτὸν συνιδρύσθαι Ἑρμῇ καὶ Ἡρακλεῖ τῷ μὲν λόγου, τῷ δ' ἀλκῆς προεστῶτι. English translation (Yonge 1853–1854): and this is plain from their having set up holy statues in his honour in their Gymnasia, along with those of Mercury

and Hercules – the one of whom is the patron of eloquence, and the other of valour.”

73 Aristophron 1933b, 71; Béquignon 1933, 251; SEG XXV, 149. The stone is stored in Athens, EM (Epigraphic Museum) 12749. I refer to Peek 1941, no. 3, 221–227, for a detailed interpretation of the whole text.

74 Keramopoulos 1933, 247–248.

yard which inspired the comparison to palaestra, dates to the Late Antique period. In the same phase two basins (fountains?) were created. I believe this enlargement should be associated with the Late Roman architectural remains on the two sides of the building (Pl. 2 c): large rooms of different dimensions on the western side, and a bath complex on the eastern side.⁷⁵ These remains belonged most likely to the same large complex, because of their orientation and date.


If the building previously identified as the palaestra is another kind of building (maybe a residential domus), this allows us to argue that the Tetragonos Peristylos, the only other monumental building in the area, could be the palaestra of the Academy. It dates back to the 4th century BC, perhaps even to the beginning of the century, according to comparison of the building technique with that of Dexileos' monument. If so, it could

have been used by Plato, who in 387 BC made use of the facilities of the Academy gymnasium for his philosophical lessons.


Finally, the correspondence between the building phases and the sources on the history of the gymnasium of the Academy is relevant. The sources do not mention any activity at the gymnasium after the first century BC, and the Tetragonos Peristylos does not provide evidence of building activity beyond the Hellenistic era.

If this reconstruction is plausible, we would have another example of a 4th century BC palaestra, which matches the plan of safely identified contemporary palaestrae; if not, we will have at least reopened a discussion on two remarkable monuments of Athens that for their complexity and history deserve comprehensive attention.


75 Walter 1940, coll. 164–165.



Pl. 1 Athens, map of the north-west area.



Pl. 2 Athens, Academy, general map; a so-called gymnasium; b Tetragnos Peristylus.



Pl. 3 Athens, Academy, building phases of the so-called gymnasium: a phase 2; b phase 3; c phase 4.

Bibliography

Alexandri 1968

Olga Alexandri. "Chronikà". *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον Χρονικά* B1 (1968), 73–75.

Aristophron 1933a

Pagagiotis Z. Aristophron. "Αἱ ἀνασκαφαὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀκαδημίαν τοῦ Πλάτωνος". *Πρακτικά της Ακαδημίας Αθηνών* 8 (1933), 243–246.

Aristophron 1933b

Pagagiotis Z. Aristophron. "Ἐκθεσις περὶ τῶν ἐκτελουμένων ἀνασκαφῶν πρὸς ἀνεύρεσιν τῆς ἀρχαίας Ἀκαδημίας". *Πρακτικά της Ακαδημίας Αθηνών* 8 (1933), 70–71.

Aristophron 1933c

Pagagiotis Z. Aristophron. "Πρὸς τὴν Ἀκαδημίαν Ἀθηνῶν". Unpublished Report dated to 21st November 1933. Nov. 1933.

Aristophron 1937

Pagagiotis Z. Aristophron. *Plato's Academy: Confession Fidei on the Occasion of the Discovery of the Ambulatory*. The Nineteenth Century and After 122. 1937.

Aristophron 1938a

Pagagiotis Z. Aristophron. *Plato's Academy: the Birth of the Idea of its Rediscovery*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Aristophron 1938b

Pagagiotis Z. Aristophron. "Πρὸς τὴν Ἀκαδημίαν Ἀθηνῶν". Unpublished Report dated to 29th October 1938. 1938.

Aristophron 1939

Pagagiotis Z. Aristophron. "Πρὸς τὴν Ἀκαδημίαν Ἀθηνῶν". Unpublished Report dated to 12th September 1939. 1939.

Balatsos 1991

Panagiotis Balatsos. "Inscriptions from the Academy". *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 86 (1991), 145–154.

Béquignon 1933

Yves Béquignon. "Chronique des fouilles et découvertes archéologiques". *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 57 (1933), 236–312.

Billot 1989

Marie-Françoise Billot. "Academie – topographie et archéologie". In *Dictionnaire des Philosophes Antiques*. Ed. by R. Goulet. Vol. 1. Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1989, 693–789.

Blegen 1933

Elizabeth P. Blegen. "New Items from Athens". *American Journal of Archaeology* 37 (1933), 491–495.

Blegen 1934

Elizabeth P. Blegen. "New Items from Athens". *American Journal of Archaeology* 38 (1934), 599–603.

Caruso 2013

Ada Caruso. *Akademia. Archeologia di una scuola filosofica ad Atene da Platone a Proclo (387 a.C.–485 d.C.)*. Studi di Archeologia e di Topografia di Atene e dell' Attica 6. Athens and Paestum: Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2013.

Chatzioti 1980

M. Chatzioti. "Τ' ΕΦΟΡΕΙΑ ΠΡΟ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΚΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΚΛΑΣΙΚΟΝ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΤΗΤΟΝ. Αρχαιολογικός χώρος 'Περιπάτου' η Ακαδημίας Πλάτωνος". *Archaiologikon Deltion* 35, B1 (1980), 37–41.

Curtius and Kaupert 1881

Ernst Curtius and Johann A. Kaupert, eds. *Karten von Attika (Heft I): Erläuternder Text: Athen und Peiraeus*. Berlin: Reimer, 1881.

Daux 1960

Georges Daux. "Une nouvelle liste amphictionique du IVe siècle a delphes". *Bulletin de correspondance Hellénique* 84 (1960), 459–466.

Delorme 1960

Jean Delorme. *Gymnasion: étude sur les monuments consacrés à l'éducation en Grèce (des origines à l'Empire Romain)*. Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 196. Paris: De Boccard, 1960.

Duhoux 1987

Yves Duhoux. "Le vocalisme des inscriptions attiques: une question de méthodes". In *Actes de la première rencontre internationale de dialectologie grecque, Nancy-Pont-à-Mousson, 1–3er juillet 1986 (= Verbum 10, 1987, fasc. 1–2–3)*. Nancy: Presses universitaires de Nancy, 1987, 179–198.

Dyer 1873

Thomas H. Dyer. *Ancient Athens: its History, Topography, and Remains*. London: Bell and Daldy, 1873.

Follet 1976

Simone Follet. *Athènes au IIe et au IIIe siècle: études chronologiques et prosopographiques*. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1976.

Frantz 1979

Allison Frantz. "A Public Building of Late Antiquity in Athens". *Hesperia. Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 48 (1979), 194–203.

Geagan 1967

Daniel J. Geagan. *The Athenian Constitution after Sulla*. *Hesperia Supplement* 12. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1967.

Glucker 1978

John Glucker. *Antiochus and the Late Academy*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.

Graindor 1922

Paul Graindor. *Marbres et inscriptions d'Athènes et d'Eleusis. Contribution à l'histoire d'Hérode Atticus et de son père*. Gand: Van Rysselberghe & Rombaut, 1922.

- von Hesberg 1995
Henner von Hesberg. "Das griechische Gymnasium im 2. Jh. v. Chr." In *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus: Kolloquium München 24. bis 26. Juni 1993*. Ed. by M. Wörrle and P. Zanker. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995, 13–27.
- Hoepfner 2002
Wolfram Hoepfner. *Antike Bibliotheken*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2002.
- von den Hoff 2009
Ralf von den Hoff. "Hellenistische Gymnasia: Raumgestaltung und Raumfunktionen." In *Stadtbilder im Hellenismus. Die hellenistische Polis als Lebensform*. Ed. by Albrecht Matthaei and Martin Zimmermann. Heidelberg: Verlag Antike, 2009, 245–275.
- Jaillard 2007
Dominique Jaillard. *Configurations d'Hermès: une 'théogonie hermaïque'*. Kernos Suppl. 17. Liège: Centre International d'Étude de la Religion Grecque Antique, 2007.
- Johnston 2003
I. Johnston Sarah. "Initiation." In *Initiation in Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives: New Critical Perspectives*. Ed. by D. B. Dodd and Ch. A. Faraone. London: Routledge, 2003, 155–180.
- Jones 1918
William Henry Samuel Jones. *Pausanias – Description of Greece. Translation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918.
- Judeich 1931
Walther Judeich. *Topographie von Athen*. 2nd ed. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1931.
- Jüthner 1965
Julius Jüthner. *Die athletischen Leibesübungen der Griechen*. Vienna and Graz: Böhlau, 1965.
- Karo 1933
Georg Karo. "Archäologische Funde vom Mai 1932 bis Juli 1933. Griechenland und Dodekanes." *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (1933), 191–217.
- Karo 1934
Georg Karo. "Archäologische Funde vom Juli 1933 bis Juli 1934. Griechenland und Dodekanes." *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (1934), 123–191.
- Keramopoulos 1933
Antonios D. Keramopoulos. "Addendum." *Πρακτικά της Ακαδημίας Αθηνών* 8 (1933), 246–248.
- Leake 1829
William M. Leake. *Topographie von Athen, nebst einigen Bemerkungen über die Alterthümer desselben*. Halle: Kümmler, 1829.
- Lemerle 1935
Paul Lemerle. "Chronique des fouilles et découvertes archéologiques dans l'Orient Hellénique (1934)." *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 59 (1935), 234–309 plates XIII–XVIII.
- Lippolis, Livadiotti, and Rocco 2007
Enzo Lippolis, Monica Livadiotti, and Giorgio Rocco. *Architettura greca: storia e monumenti del mondo della polis dalle origini al V secolo*. Milano: Mondadori, 2007.
- Lygkouri-Tolia 1993 [1998]
E. Lygkouri-Tolia. "Τ' ΕΦΟΡΕΙΑ ΠΡΟ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΚΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΚΛΑΣΙΚΟΝ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΤΗΤΟΝ. Αρχαιολογικό έλσος της Ακαδημίας Πλάτωνος." *Archaiologikon Deltion* 48, B1 (1993 [1998]), 61–62.
- Lygouri 1996
Eutychia Lygouri. "Οδός Ρηγίλλης." *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον Χρονικά* 51 (1996), 46–48.
- Lygouri 2000
Eutychia Lygouri. "Αρχαιολογικός χώρος Ακαδημία Πλάτωνος." *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον Χρονικά* 55 (2000), 70–71.
- Lygouri 2002
Eutychia Lygouri. "Excavating an Ancient Palaestra in Athens." In *Excavating Classical Culture. Recent Archaeological Discoveries in Greece*. Ed. by M. Yeroulanou. Studies in Classical Archaeology 1 1031. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2002, 203–212.
- Lynch 1972
John P. Lynch. *Aristotle's school*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.
- Lynch 1984
John P. Lynch. "Hipparchos' Wall in the Academy at Athens. A Closer Look at the Tradition." In *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow on His Eightieth Birthday*. Ed. by A. L. Boegehold, K. J. Rigsby, and S. Dow. Greek, Roman and Byzantine Monographs 10. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1984, 173–179.
- Marchiandi 2003
Daniela Marchiandi. "L'Accademia: un capitolato trascurato dell'Atene dei Tiranni." *Anuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle missioni italiane in Oriente* 81 (2003), 11–81.
- Morison 1988
William S. Morison. *Attic Gymnasia and Palaestrai Inscriptions from the Archaic Period to 336/335 B.C.* Ann Arbor: UMI, 1988.
- Murray 2006
James S. Murray. "Searching for Plato's Academy, 1929–1940." *Museion: Journal of the Classical Association of Canada* 6.2 (2006), 219–256.
- Natorp 1894
Paul Natorp. "Akademia." *Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 1.1 (1894), 1134–1137.
- Oliver 1933
James H. Oliver. "Selected Greek Inscriptions." *Hesperia. Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 2 (1933), 480–513.
- Orlandos 1956
Anastasios K. Orlandos. "Αθήναι. Ακαδημία Πλάτωνος, Το έργον της Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας κατά το 1955." In *Το έργον της Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας κατά το 1955*. Athens: Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία, 1956, 14–18.
- Orlandos 1968
Anastasios K. Orlandos. *Les matériaux de construction et la technique architecturale des anciens Grecs (Travaux et mémoires 16 et 16 bis)*. Vol. 2. Paris: De Boccard, 1968.

- Papayannopoulos-Palaios 1937**
Andreas A. Papayannopoulos-Palaios. *Ἡ ἀκριβὴς θέσις τῆς Ἀκαδημείας*. Athens, 1937.
- Papayannopoulos-Palaios 1952–1953**
Andreas A. Papayannopoulos-Palaios. “Ἀκαδημεικὰ”. *Πολέμων. Αρχαιολογικὸν Περιοδικόν* 5 (1952–1953), 74–80.
- Payne 1934**
Humphry G. G. Payne. “Archaeology in Greece”. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 54 (1934), 185–200.
- Peck 1941**
Werner Peck. “Attische Urkunden”. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 56 (1941), 218–239.
- Reinmuth 1961**
Oscar W. Reinmuth. “Ephebic Text from Athens”. *Hesperia. Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 30 (1961), 8–22.
- Ritchie 1984**
Charles E. Ritchie. *The Athenian Boundary Stones of Public Domain*. Colorado: University of Colorado, 1984.
- Stavropoulos 1958**
Ph. D. Stavropoulos. “Ἀνασκαφὴ Ἀρχαίας Ἀκαδημίας”. *Πρακτικά της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικῆς Εταιρείας* (1958), 5–13 pls. 12–14.
- Stavropoulos 1963**
Ph. D. Stavropoulos. “Ἀνασκαφὴ Ἀρχαίας Ἀκαδημίας”. *Πρακτικά της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικῆς Εταιρείας* (1963), 5–28 pls. 1–21.
- Stavropoulos 1969**
Ph. D. Stavropoulos. “Ἀκαδημία, in Μεγάλη Ἑλληνικὴ Ἑγκυκλοπαίδεια”. In: Συμπλήρωμα 22. Athenai, 1969, 341–344.
- Taylor 1823**
Thomas Taylor. *Select Works of Porphyry; Containing his Four Books On Abstinence from Animal Food; his Treatise On the Homeric cave of the Nymphs; and his Auxiliaries to the Perception of Intelligible Natures*. London: T. Rodd, 1823.
- Threatte 2007**
Leslie Threatte. *The Inscribed Schist Fragments from the Athens Academy Excavations*. Athens: Hellēnikē Epigraphikē Hetaireia, 2007.
- Touchais 1989**
Gilles Touchais. “Chronique des fouilles”. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 113 (1989), 587–588.
- Travlos 1960**
John Travlos. *Πολεοδομικὴ ἐξέλιξις των Αθηνών: από των προϊστορικών χρόνων μέχρι των αρχών του 19ου αιώνας*. Athens, 1960.
- Travlos 1971**
John Travlos. *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1971.
- Trombetti 2013**
Carla Trombetti. *Il ginnasio greco. Genesi, topografia e culti dei luoghi della paideia*. *British Archaeological Reports. International Series* 2527. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2013.
- Trombetti 2006**
Catia Trombetti. “Ginnasi come santuari. Il Peloponneso, estratto della tesi di specializzazione in Archeologia dell’Università di Matera”. *Sirys* 7 (2006), 45–69.
- Vanderpool 1959**
Eugene Vanderpool. “News Letters from Greece”. *American Journal of Archaeology* 63 (1959), 278–283.
- Vernant 1974**
Jean-Pierre Vernant. *Mythe et pensée chez les Grecs: études de psychologie historique*. Paris: Maspero, 1974.
- Wachsmuth 1874**
Curt Wachsmuth. *Die Stadt Athen im Alterthum*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1874.
- Wachsmuth 1894**
Curt Wachsmuth. “Akademia”. *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* I.1 (1894), 1132–1134.
- Wacker 1996**
Christian Wacker. *Das Gymnasion in Olympia. Geschichte und Funktion*. Würzburg: Ergon-Verlag, 1996.
- Walter 1940**
Otto Walter. “Archäologische Funde”. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 20 (1940), 164–165.
- Winter 2006**
Frederick Winter. *Studies in Hellenistic Architecture*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.
- Wycheley 1962**
Richard E. Wycheley. “Peripatos: The Athenian Philosophical Scene, 2”. *Greece and Rome* 9 (1962), 2–21.
- Wycheley 1978**
Richard E. Wycheley. *The Stones of Athens*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.
- Yonge 1853–1854**
Charles Duke Yonge. *The Deipnosophists; or, Banquet of the learned, of Athenaeus*. Translation. London: H. G. Bohn, 1853–1854.

Illustration and plate credits

ILLUSTRATIONS: 1 Aristophron 1933b, pl. α, fig. 4. 3–9 Photo Ada Caruso. **PLATES:** 1 Caruso 2013, 49, fig. 1.

2 Archive of the Ephorate of Antiquities. 3 Caruso 2013, fig. 40.

ADA CARUSO

PhD Rome, Sapienza; Caruso is researcher at the University of Calabria. She had post-doc positions in Rome (German Archaeological Institute) and Athens (Italian Archaeological School; Norwegian Institute; Kapodistrian University) and a fellowship from the Onassis Foundation. Her research focuses on the Greek world: topography, religion, venues for intellectual activities, philosophical schools and athletics. She published books on the archaeology of Plato's school (2013) and shrines of the Muses (2016).

Dr. Ada Caruso
Università della Calabria
Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici
Cubo 21b
Arcavacata di Rende (CS), Italy
E-Mail: adacaruso@live.it

Riccardo Di Cesare

Hellenistic Gymnasia in the Heart of Athens: Change and Continuity

Summary

While the old gymnasia (Academy, Lyceum, Kynosarges) were situated outside the walls of Athens, two new gymnasia were built in the city's heart soon after 229 BC: the Diogeneion and the Ptolemaion. This paper discusses the history, architecture and function of these two gymnasia, reviewing both literary and epigraphic evidence and the archaeological remains in the area of their probable location. These complexes had a remarkable urbanistic impact, introducing a touch of modernity into the chaotic and old-fashioned centre of the town. While their exact location is still debated, they established a firm topographical and ideological connection with the older city-centre ('Old Agora') and served the headquarters of ephebic training and education throughout the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

Keywords: Athens; gymnasia; Ptolemaion; Diogeneion, *ephebeia*; Old Agora; Theseus

Während die alten Gymnasia (Akademie, Lykaion, Kynosarges) außerhalb der Stadtmauern Athens lagen, wurden kurz nach 229 v. Chr. zwei neue Gymnasia im Zentrum der Stadt errichtet: das Diogeneion und das Ptolemaion. In diesem Beitrag werden die Geschichte, Architektur und Funktion dieser bei-

den Gymnasia untersucht, auf Basis einer systematischen Analyse aller relevanten literarischen, epigraphischen und archäologischen Quellen. Die Komplexe waren wichtig für das Stadtbild, weil sie dem chaotischen, altmodischen Zentrum einen Hauch von Modernität verliehen. Ihre exakte Lage bleibt zwar umstritten, aber sie waren topographisch und ideologisch fest mit dem alten Stadtzentrum verbunden und dienten als Zentren für die Ausbildung der Epheben in der gesamten hellenistischen und römischen Zeit.

Keywords: Athen; Gymnasia; Ptolemaion; Diogeneion; Ephebie; Alte Agora; Theseus

I would like to express my kindest thanks to Monika Trümper and Ulrich Mania for organizing this Conference and for their warm hospitality. I would also like to thank all the colleagues who participated and contributed to the scientific discussion with their helpful suggestions; the colleagues of the Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens, especially Nikos Tsoniotis and Dimitris Sourlas for their kind willingness in every visit to the archaeological sites; the team with whom I work in the *Topografia di Atene* project.

The aim of this paper is to focus on ancient Athens, namely on one or possibly two gymnasia belonging to the Hellenistic period: the Diogeneion and the Ptolemaion. Built most likely in the third century BC, they survived until the second half of the third century AD. At the present state of research, it is not possible to obtain a concrete view of their physical appearance because – at least in this writer’s opinion – they have not yet been found nor securely identified. Nonetheless, the available documentary sources testify the relevance they had in the life of the polis. Thus the history of both complexes can serve as a useful case-study to explore the connections between the buildings, the polis identity and the shaping of the urban spaces through time.

Old evidence can now be re-examined taking into account the enhanced knowledge of the archaeology of the city. Recent explorations by the Ephorate of Antiquities of Athens in the area north of the Acropolis, where the gymnasia are likely to have been, have provided new data; a review of the archaeological evidence, deriving both from systematic excavations in the key monumental sites and from the rescue-activities carried out in the modern city centre, can contribute when taking a fresh look at the urban history and to focus on some specific points related to the gymnasia under examination (Pl. 1).¹

1 Gymnasia in the urban history of Athens: an outline

As is well known, the gymnasium (as an institution as well as a facility) played a key role in defining the identity of the polis. The study of gymnasia is therefore essential for understanding urban development and exploring the dynamics of change and continuity in the history of a city, both as a space and as a society which produce the city’s monumental image.

Throughout the centuries, Athens had many gymnasia. Three dated to the Archaic age: the Academy, the Lyceum, and the Kynosarges, all located outside the city

walls in the *proasteion* (the liminal ‘belt’ of the *asty*), respectively to the north-west, to the east and to the south-east.² These were the traditional and most renowned gymnasia of the polis, each provided with a distinct ‘personality’ and with local cults and legends. They were deeply-rooted in the religious, military and civic life and served as centres for educating young citizens.

The Academy, sacred to the hero Hekademos, housed the olive-trees of Athena; it was associated then with the poliadic goddess and with other gods, such as Hephaistos. At some major civic festivals magnificent torch-races began there and continued along the wide processional route that linked the Academy with the Kerameikos and the Acropolis. Close to the Kolonos Hippios and frequented by the Athenian cavalry, the Academy was the most ‘aristocratic’ among the Athenian gymnasia, embodying and bolstering the values of the *archaia paideusis* (the traditional education), focused upon athletic training and music.³ Coherently it was the ideological term of the *Demosion Sema*, the state cemetery for the war dead, who were rated as heroes and ideal citizens.

The Lyceum originated from a precinct sacred to Apollo Lykeios, while the Kynosarges adjoined a sanctuary of Herakles. The former gymnasium was used by horsemen and hoplites for exercise and, like the Academy, was frequented by ephebes, as attested in Hellenistic inscriptions.⁴ The latter was associated with *nothoi* (those born from a foreign mother), but it was soon equated to the other main gymnasia.

Literary tradition connects distinguished Athenians with the foundation, the architectural refurbishment or simply the presence in one or the other gymnasium: the Peisistratids and Kimon with the Academy, Peisistratos, Pericles, and Lycurgus with the Lyceum, and Themistocles with the Kynosarges. Since the Archaic age, these gymnasia probably also served as aggregation points for political groups. From large open spaces with running tracks, places for wrestling, a water supply and

1 For recent research activities by the Ephorate in the area to the north of the Acropolis: Tsoniotis 2007 [2014]; D. Sourlas 2007 [2014]; Tsoniotis 2006 [2014]; Tsoniotis 2012; D. Sourlas 2013; Tsoniotis 2013; Tsoniotis 2014; D. Sourlas 2014. For an overview of the archaeological data concerning the areas to the east and the north of the Acropolis, see Longo 2011; DiCesare 2014, with references to the excavations reports.

2 Academy: Delorme 1960, 36–42; Kyle 1987, 71–77; Billot 1989; Caruso 2013; Trombetti 2013, 6–29; Marchiandi 2014a; Di Cesare 2015b, 233–

246. Lyceum: Delorme 1960, 42–45, 54–58; Kyle 1987, 77–84; Trombetti 2013, 30–39; Marchiandi 2014b. Kynosarges: Delorme 1960, 58–59; Kyle 1987, 84–92; Billot 1994; Privitera 2011a; Privitera 2011b; Trombetti 2013, 39–52. – For an up-to-date overview of the Athenian gymnasia: De Domenico 2018.

3 *Ar. Nub.* vv. 961–1023.

4 Lynch 1972, 157, with a list of second century BC inscriptions.

groves, they developed into more elaborate facilities during the Archaic and Classical ages. Furthermore, from the fourth century BC they became the seats of concurrent philosophical schools.

In the Hellenistic age, two more gymnasia were added to the urban landscape and will be discussed in this paper: the Diogeneion and the Ptolemaion. Unlike the old gymnasia of the polis, they were given a central position in the town, thus following a trend in Greek city planning of the fourth and third centuries BC.⁵ As will be examined below, this location was nonetheless of specific significance.

At least in the second century AD there were other gymnasia in Athens which Pausanias refers to: one, known as “of Hermes”, was posited along the road leading from the Dipylon Gate to the Agora; another, of uncertain position, was named after the emperor Hadrian.⁶

In addition to these examples, there are epigraphic testimonia of more unidentified gymnasia. A fragmentary inscription of 305/304 BC, found in the Piraeus, which contains a decree in praise of the officials of the *ephebeia* and the *epheboi*, was to be published ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ τῶν ἐφήβων.⁷

A boundary stone of a gymnasium (ῥο[ς] γυμν[ασίου]), dating to the third century BC, was found near the Odeion of Herodes Atticus, not far from the place where, according to recent studies, the Lycurgan Panathenaic Stadium would have been located.⁸ A second stone, with a similar text (ῥος γυμνασίου) but of unspecified date, was found by K. Rhomaïos at the south of the Acropolis, re-employed in a wall found between what are currently Veikou and Drakou Streets.⁹ The stones have been transplanted from one or two Athenian gymnasia possibly placed within the city, such as the Ptolemaion or the Diogeneion.

In addition, from the Classical period onwards, Athens was well equipped with several *palaistrai*, featuring a developed architectural design.¹⁰ They were often named after private citizens, but it is not clear if they were state owned or privately owned.¹¹

2 Athens in the third century BC

Before trying to place the Ptolemaion and the Diogeneion within the monumental palimpsest of the city, a glance at the archaeological plan of Athens, namely of the northern quarters, is required. Leaving out of consideration the Roman Market, the so-called Hadrian’s Library and some adjoining buildings of Hellenistic/Roman date, it is not difficult to obtain a view of what the Late Classical and Hellenistic city looked like. The many remnants of walls, floors and streets unearthed under the modern town give the idea of a maze of houses and streets, many of them related to the urban Gates. A large part of Athens to the north and east of the Acropolis was, in fact, residential: houses were attached to small sanctuaries, streets and other buildings, while outside the walls they were interspersed amongst cemeteries and workshops.¹² Athens was a very old city and it differed radically from other Hellenistic centres which adopted different, more up-to-date, urbanistic principles. This was the *forma Urbis Athenarum* perceived by Heraclides Criticus (or Creticus), the third century BC author of a treatise *On the Greek Cities*: the city was dry and looked ugly with small and uncomfortable houses; streets were badly arranged because of their antiquity. A visitor would hardly believe that he had reached the famous Athens. But soon the writer re-qualifies the city, thanks to the grandeur of its monuments: the Parthenon, the theatre, the unfinished Olympieion, and its three charming gymnasia – γυμνάσια τρία, Ἀκαδημία, Λύκειον, Κυνόσαργες – all surrounded by trees and lawns.¹³

In Heraclides’ treatise there is no mention, however, of the one or two Hellenistic gymnasia of Ptolemy and of Diogenes, possibly because both were built some years later, and after the writer’s visit, or because they were too recent to deserve any mention. It may be argued that the

5 Von Hesberg 1995, 14–15; this was, however, not the rule, see the remarks of von den Hoff 2009, 252–253.

6 Gymnasium of Hermes: Paus. I.2.5. Gymnasium of Hadrian: I.18.9; S. Privitera in Greco, Longo, et al. 2011, 504–505.

7 IG II² 478, 30.

8 M. Levensohn and E. Levensohn 1947, 65 no. 2. The location of the Panathenaic Stadium: Kalligas 2009; *contra*, Korres 2015, 133, 135 n. 23.

9 Threpsiadis 1950, 65 n. 2. Sometimes the two stones are considered the same; Ma 2008, 14 n. 26.

10 As the one described in Pl. *Lys.* 203a–207a.

11 Ps.–Xen., *Ath. Pol.* 2.10, with Kyle 1987, 66–69, 144; Antipho, Fr. 66 Blass–Thalheim (*palaistra* of Sibyrtios); Pl. *Chrm.* 153a (p. of Taureas); Ps.–Plut., *X orat.* 837e (p. of Hippokrates); Lys. Fr. 75 Thalheim (anonymous p.); see Di Nicuolo 2014.

12 Monaco 2013b; Monaco 2013a; Di Cesare 2014c, 721–725.

13 Heraclides Fr. 1 Pfister = I Arenz. As for the date, Arenz 2006 favours 271–267 BC, while Chaniotis 2008, 109 n. 24, argues for 229–200 BC.

newly built Hellenistic facilities had a great impact on the traditional urban landscape, introducing a touch of ‘modernity’ into the chaotic and antiquated center of the town. Public building activity had shaped, in the past, the physical image as well as the civic awareness of the Athenians; but, after the big *erga* of Pericles and Lycurgus, no great buildings were added to the *asty*. Therefore, the two third century BC gymnasia opened a new building season, which was pursued in the following decades and century, by the gift of the Lakydeion garden to the Academy by Attalos I, the reshaping of the Agora between the second and third quarter of the second century BC (Middle Stoa, East Building, South Stoa II, Attalos Stoa, Metroon), the construction of the Stoa of Eumenes on the south slopes of the Acropolis (197–159 BC), of the portico(es) (around 160 BC) flanking the large street at the east of the Tower of the Winds, the new building stage of the Olympieion by Antiochus IV (175–163 BC) and the Ptolemaic foundation of the Serapeion.¹⁴

2.1 The Diogeneion

The Diogeneion is linked with a remarkable event in the Hellenistic history of Athens: the liberation from the last Macedonian garrison in 229 BC. In that year, the Athenians convinced the commander Diogenes, after paying him a large sum, to leave the Piraeus and Athens with his troops.¹⁵ Diogenes received Athenian citizenship, the front seat (*proedria*) in the theater and probably public maintenance (*sitesis*) in the Prytaneion; he took the title of Euergetes and the new annual festival of the Diogeneia was instituted, centred in the Diogeneion.¹⁶

It is not clear who funded the construction – if it was the person honored by the Athenians or the Athenians themselves as a token of gratitude.¹⁷

What was the Diogeneion and what did it look like? The earliest epigraphic reference to it dates back to 107/106 BC. The Diogeneion was already an old structure at the time, since the ephebic decree records the repairs to its walled precinct (*peribolos*), which had fallen down. These repairs were made by the *kosmetes* Eudoxos and paid for at his own expense.¹⁸ It contained (or at least was) a *temenos*, as inscriptions record that the *epheboi* and the *kosmetes* were attending sacrifices at the Diogeneia ἐν τῷ τεμένει.¹⁹ This *temenos*, therefore, was consecrated to the cult of the Euergetes²⁰ and hence it contained at least one altar.

As is clear from the epigraphic evidence, from the Hellenistic age until the second half of the third century AD, the Diogeneion was one of the main centres of ephebic activity;²¹ this is the reason why the *kosmetes* paid for its partial rebuilding. A reference in Plutarch helps to better understand the functions of the place.²² The author was well acquainted with the Diogeneion: he had probably been *ephebos* in Athens, studying under Ammonius, a Platonic philosopher and strategos.²³ The dramatic date of the *Quaestio convivialis* under consideration is AD 70 and the relevant passage reads: “While in charge as hoplite general at Athens, Ammonius heard a demonstration (*apodeixis*) given in the Diogeneion by the *epheboi* who were studying literature, geometry, rhetoric and music; then he invited the successful teachers to dinner.”²⁴

Some other information is added by the officials in

14 Lakydeion: Schaaf 1992, 112–119; Agora: Camp 2010, 20–21; Longo 2014, 883–885; Stoa of Eumenes: Korres 2015, 129–146; Portico(es): Korres 1994, 140–145, figs. 5 and 8; Di Cesare 2014c; Olympieion: Santaniello 2011; Serapeion: Paus. I.18.4.

15 Plut. *Arat.* 34.5–6; Paus. II.8.6.

16 Habicht 1982, 82–84; Habicht 1995, 182–183; Mikalson 1998, 172.

17 For the Diogeneion: Ferguson 1911, 238–239; Graindor 1915, 241–244; Guidi 1921–1922; Graindor 1922, 220–228; Judeich 1931, 92, 379; Delorme 1960, 143–146; Pélékidis 1962, 264–266; Lattanzi 1968, 21–23; Travlos 1971, 577 fig. 722 no. U, 579; Bringmann and Steuben 1995, 45–46; Lippolis 1995, 51–55; Miller 1995, 207–208, 243–244; Mikalson 1998, 172; Kotsidu 2000, 70; Krumeich 2004, 133–135; Di Cesare 2014b; D. S. Surlas 2015, 311–312. Delorme 1960, 144, refused to connect the gymnasium with the Macedonian commander, and thought of a homonymous person of the second century. Umholtz 1994, 133–135, has suggested that the Athenians gave the name of Diogenes to a building already under construction.

18 IG II² 1011, 41: καταπεσόντος δὲ τοῦ περιβόλου τοῦ Διογενείου προ-

νοήθ[η] τῆς ἐπισκευῆς αὐτοῦ ἀναδείξ[α]ντος τὴν εἰς τ[ὸ] αὐτὰ δαπάνην ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων.

19 IG II² 1039, 55–56; compare 1040, 2–3 and 1043, 48–49.

20 For the sacrifices (*thysiai*) to Diogenes Euergetes compare e.g. IG II² 1141, 14–15. For the sacrifice of two bulls at the Diogeneia by ephebes see e.g. IG II² 1028, 23–24.

21 The end of the Diogeneion is in some way related to the end of the ephebeia, institution that, according to some scholars, went on until the fifth century AD; Kennell 2006, XIV, 62–64; Remijsen 2015, 62–63. According to Frantz 1979, SEG 29, 199, the Diogeneion would have been restored in AD 396–401, on the basis of her integration of IG II² 5205 = 13292.

22 Plut. *Qu. Conv.* IX.1.1 (736D Wytténbach).

23 Scarcella 1995.

24 Ἀμμώνιος Ἀθήνησι στρατηγῶν ἀπόδειξιν ἔλαβε <ἐν> τῷ Διογενείῳ τῶν γράμματα καὶ γεωμετρίαν καὶ τὰ ῥητορικά καὶ μουσικὴν μανθανόντων ἐφήβων. Note that ἐν has been added by Madvig (see the Teubner edition by C. Hubert, *app. crit. ad loc.*).

charge there, such as *hypopaidotribes*, the *grammateus*, the *hypogrammateus*, the *didaskalos*, the *hegemon*, the *hoplomachos* and the *kestrophylax*. A *thyroros* is also known;²⁵ another official, ὁ ἐπὶ Διογενείου, was probably a caretaker of the grounds and the building(s), stationed permanently at the Diogeneion.²⁶ The *kosmetes* as the head of ephebic training was also a key figure there.²⁷ Finally, a group called “those around the Diogeneion” (οἱ περὶ τὸ Διογένειον) was at home in the gymnasium from the end of the second century AD.²⁸

Some scholars have pointed out that in not one of the extant sources the Diogeneion is expressly called a gymnasium; hence the possibility that it could have been just a *heroon* or a palaestra attached to a larger gymnasium, that of Ptolemy.²⁹ Furthermore, as will be observed later, Plutarch and Pausanias, writing in the Imperial age, mention only one gymnasium in the centre of the city.

On the other hand, the literary and epigraphic testimonia so far taken into account, spanning from Hellenistic to Roman times, give the Diogeneion the status of a gymnasium in its functions.³⁰ The ephebes there were given both an intellectual and athletic/(para)military instruction, as is clear from the presence of the specific staff.³¹ At the same time, the Diogeneion emerges from the sources as an easily distinguishable place which is never mentioned in association with the Ptolemaion. It is less likely, then, that it constituted just a part of the other gymnasium.

A *palaistra* used by ephebes, mentioned in an inscription, may perhaps be connected with the Diogeneion.³² The text refers to the erection of a *kosmetes*

herm in that palaestra, and herms of the same kind, that is supporting portrait-heads of the officials of the *ephebeia*, were found in the Post-Herulian Wall near the church of Agios Dimitrios Katiphoris along with ephebic decrees mentioning the Diogeneion,³³ with one of these texts expressly pointing out the Diogeneion as the place of display.³⁴

2.2 The Ptolemaion

Writing at the end of the first century/beginning of the second century AD, Plutarch in the *Life of Theseus* affirms that the hero's bones lie buried “in the heart of the city, near the gymnasium of our days”: ἐν μέσῃ τῇ πόλει, παρὰ τὸ νῦν γυμνάσιον.³⁵ He is referring to the Ptolemaion, since some decades later Pausanias established the same spatial relation between the gymnasium and Theseus' sanctuary, the Theseion, said to be ‘near’ the former: πρὸς δὲ τῷ γυμνασίῳ (*scil.* of Ptolemy, mentioned just before) Θησέως ἐστὶν ἱερόν.³⁶ In the same passage the writer supplies other short but invaluable information about topography (see *infra*) and the historical circumstances of the construction: from the verb employed, κατασκευάζω, the gymnasium emerges as a gift to the polis by King Ptolemy (Πτολεμαίου δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ κατασκευασαμένου καλουμένῳ).³⁷ Pausanias briefly refers to the sculptural adornment of the place: herms (suitable to the setting) and statues, viz. of a Ptolemy (probably as the founder of the gymnasium), of the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus and of Juba II of Mauretania (a friend of Augustus). The portrait-gallery included also historical persons on gilded shields.³⁸

25 The ‘officials’ mentioned above are listed in IG II² 2221, 70–76, under the heading τάξεις ἐν Διογενείῳ. For the ἐπὶ Διογενείῳ κεστροφύλαξ compare IG II² 2208, 39 (212/213 AD or later).

26 Compare e.g. IG II² 2018, 142; 2208, 41; 2239, 25. This caretaker appears in inscriptions dating back from the beginning of the second century AD.

27 For his ἐπιμέλεια περὶ τὸ Διογένειον see IG II² 3741, 9–10 (145/146 AD).

28 The identity of the group is debated: a particular class of ephebes; Graindor 1922: *mellepheboi*; Reinmuth 1959; Reinmuth 1962: pre-ephebes or ephebes younger than 18; or the staff of the Diogeneion; Dow 1958; Dow 1960.

29 The two hypotheses in Lippolis 1995, 56, 66; Miller 1995, 207–208 and Mikalson 1998, 172, respectively.

30 Compare Goette 1997, 180: “ein gymnasionähnlicher Bau”.

31 For the gymnasia and the education of the ephebes in the Hellenistic period see Gauthier 1995 and, lastly, Burkhardt 2004; Kah and Scholz 2004; Scholz 2004; Kennell 2015; Kyle 2015, 234–236. The chronological problem of the beginnings of an organized Athenian ephebeia is examined afresh by Chankowski 2014. For the Athenian ephebeia in the Roman

period: Newby 2005, 168–201.

32 IG II² 2037, 1 (AD 125/126): ἐν εὐφρήβοισι παλαίστραι. This palaestra “for the ephebes” is clearly distinct from other palaestrae used by *paides*, known from Hellenistic inscriptions and existing in Athens in the second century BC, i.e. that of Timeas (IG II² 956, 61–63; 957, 46–48), of Antigenes (IG II² 958, 60, 62) and another whose name is lost (IG II² 960, 25–27).

33 Graindor 1915; Lattanzi 1968; Krumeich 2004; Vlachogianni 2018a; Vlachogianni 2018b; E. Vlachogianni in Lagogianni-Georgakarakos and Papi 2018, 203–241, Cat. no. 21–59.

34 IG II² 1078, 41–42 (ca. AD 220).

35 Plut. *Thes.* 36.4.

36 Paus. I.17.2.

37 Schaaf 1992, 73–74, 81–82; Kotsidu 2000, 69–70. According to Lauter 1986, 16, and Habicht 1982, 112–117, the gymnasium was, on the contrary, a gift of the Athenians to the King.

38 IG II² 1070, 6–9 (beginning of the first century AD). For the sculptural adornment of the Ptolemaion, see Kazakidi 2015, 215–217. A statue

This gymnasium has been assigned to different Ptolemies of the third and second centuries BC.³⁹ Historical probability favors Ptolemy II Philadelphus (283–246 BC) or Ptolemy III Euergetes (246–221 BC). The hitherto oldest epigraphic occurrence of the Ptolemaion is of 122/121 BC⁴⁰ but, accepting a plausible restoration of a more ancient inscription, the gymnasium would date back at least to the third last decade of the third century BC.⁴¹ In 224/223 BC, under the rule of Ptolemy III, a new tribe was created, called Ptolemais, so that the Egyptian king became one of the eponymous heroes;⁴² a priesthood of Ptolemy and his wife Berenike II was established; a festival, the Ptolemaia, was added to the sacred calendar of the Athenians.⁴³ The gymnasium is likely to belong to this very political climate and was strictly connected with both the honors received by the King and with his role as warrantor of the freedom of the polis in the years following independence from the Macedonians.

Like the Diogeneion, the Ptolemaion was a centre of the *ephebeia* and the seat of intellectual activity, provided with lecture halls and facilities for gymnastic training. Apollodoros reports that in the middle of the second century BC an unknown philosopher founded a school there among athletes intent on training;⁴⁴ in 122/121 BC the ephebes are praised for having attended academic courses held by Zenodotus (a Stoic philosopher) at the Ptolemaion and at the Lyceum, as well as by other philosophers in the Lyceum and the Academy.⁴⁵ Cicero could write to Brutus that he, along with Piso, was used

to hearing Antiochus (the head of the Academy) lecturing *in eo gymnasio, quod Ptolemaeum vocatur*.⁴⁶ Such a use of the place explains why statues of philosophers, like the one of Chrysippus, were erected there.⁴⁷

From 116/115 BC onwards, epigraphic sources attest the existence of a library, the contents of which increased with an annual donation of one hundred books by the ephebes when they graduated.⁴⁸ The model was that of the great Hellenistic capitals, such as Alexandria and Pergamon: the gift of Ptolemy for the city willing to honor him had a cosmopolitan allure.⁴⁹

Other architectural features of this gymnasium gathered from the inscriptions are: a *stoa*;⁵⁰ a *balbis* and an *exedra*, if the ascription to the Ptolemaion of an inventory found in the Athenian Agora is correct. It also records statues of gods (Asklepios, Hygieia, Artemis, Hermes), the Mousai, personifications such as Komodia and mythological figures like the Centaurs and the Kouretes, all subjects at home in a gymnasium.⁵¹

3 In search of the urban gymnasia

Pausanias describes the Gymnasium of Ptolemy after the *agora*, stating that the Gymnasium was not very far: ἐν δὲ τῷ γυμνασίῳ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἀπέχοντι οὐ πολὺ.⁵² Since the writer repeatedly refers to the Athenian Agora as the Kerameikos, he seems to use the term *agora* to denote the

of Ptolemy son of Juba (IG II² 3445) was probably erected there. For Chrysippus, see von den Hoff 1994, 96–111; Di Cesare 2014d, 750.

- 39 A review of the various proposals in Schaaf 1992, 75. Essential literature: Wycherley 1957, 142–144; Delorme 1960, 146–147; Thompson 1966, 40–48; Thompson 1968, 37–41; Habicht 1982, 112–117; Schaaf 1992, 73–83; Bringmann and Steuben 1995, 45–48 no. 17 [L]+[E]+[A]; Lippolis 1995, 47–54; Miller 1995, 203–207; Wacker 1996, 173–178; Mikalson 1998, 178–181; Bringmann 2000, 12, 158, 160–161; Kotsidu 2000, 69–70, no. 19 [L]; Schmidt-Dounas 2000, 226–227; Lippolis 2006, 51–52; Marchetti 2012, 210–218; Saladino 2012, 176–180; Trombetti 2013, 59–60; Di Cesare 2014d; D. S. Sourlas 2015, 312–314.
- 40 IG II² 1006, 19 ([ἐν τε] τῷ Πτολεμαίῳ), 122/121 BC.
- 41 For the restoration of IG II² 836 see Oikonomides 1964, 52 no. 2 and Habicht 1995, 184–186 (SEG 21, 397; 32, 121): εἰς τὴν σ[/τοῦ] τὴν ἐν [τε] παλαίστραι (?) τοῦ γυμνασίου τοῦ]/βασιλέως Π[τολεμαίου κτλ.].
- 42 His statue was added to the monument of eponymous heroes in the Agora: Paus. I.5.5.
- 43 Ferguson 1911, 239; Habicht 1982, 112–117; Schaaf 1992, 56. 80–81; Kotsidu 2000, 65–69 no. 18 [L]+[E]+[A].
- 44 Apollod. *FGHist* 244 F 59.
- 45 IG II² 1006, 19–20.
- 46 Cic. *Fin.* V.1.

- 47 The statue of Chrysippos (dead in 208 or 204 BC) has sometimes been used as an argument to support the higher dating of the gymnasium; Pélékidis 1962, 263; Wacker 1996, 174; but the statue could have been dedicated long after the philosopher's death. It was different from the one located in *Ceramico* (Cic. *Fin.* I.39; compare Diogenes Laertius VII.182: ἐν Κεραμεικῷ). Marchetti 2012, 210–216 is of a different opinion, and tries to place the Ptolemaion in the Athenian Agora, in the so-called South Square, reviving an old idea of Thompson and Travlos, later dismissed by these very same scholars.
- 48 IG II² 1009 and Meritt 1947, 170–172, no. 67.30–32 (without the mention of the Ptolemaion, such as in IG II² 1030, 36–37 and 1042.d1). The gymnasium is expressly mentioned in IG II² 1029, 25–6 (96/95 BC); SEG 22, 111.30 (46/45 BC); IG II² 1041, 24 (43/42 BC); IG II² 1043, 50 (38/37 BC).
- 49 See now Brenk 2007.
- 50 SEG 32, 121.3–4
- 51 Clay 1977; SEG 26, 139, 170–135 BC. The view of the editor has been recently challenged: it has been suggested that the inscription (or part of it) could pertain to the Asklepieion at the south slopes of the Acropolis; Ma 2008.
- 52 Paus. I.17.2.



Fig. 1 The area to the east of the Roman Agora: the Tower of the Winds and the arched façade.

marketplace of his time: the Roman Agora.⁵³ Such an interpretation would better explain why the next topographical fixed point is the sanctuary of Theseus, which was near the gymnasium, as seen above. Pausanias' description is seemingly structured as a clockwise 'route' from the Kerameikos to the Ilissos; after the Ptolemaion-Theseion pair, he mentions the Anakeion (the sanctuary of the Dioskouroi) and Aglauros' sanctuary firmly located in the cave at the eastern slopes of the Acropolis.⁵⁴ Therefore the Gymnasium of Ptolemy must be sought in the area encompassed by the Roman Agora and the Aglaurion.

In search of the Ptolemaion, some scholars have looked with good reason at the area eastwards of the Tower of the Winds (Pls. 2–3).

S. G. Miller's hypothesis is to consider modern Kyrristou Street, unusually straight in the modern Plaka, as a relic of the *xystos*: the portico covering the running-track should be recognized in the Hellenistic stoa behind the Tower of the Winds, flanking the so-called Agoranomion. The characteristic façade with a three arched

marble lintel would have been an original part of the Gymnasium, which was later transformed (Figs. 1–2).⁵⁵

Although with a different reconstruction, E. Lippolis sets the Gymnasium in the same area: the huge building whose remains are still visible along Adrianou Street (Fig. 3), traditionally reconstructed as a basilical building and identified as the Pantheon or the Panhellenion, would not be Hadrianic in date, as is usually believed, and should be considered as the north wing of the Ptolemaion in a first century AD reshaping.⁵⁶

A different restitution of the archaeological evidence has been advanced by M. Korres. The so-called Agoranomion (or Sebasteion)⁵⁷ would simply be a formal entrance to a broad street flanked by two porticoes, the architectural members of which were re-employed for the late-antique restorations of the cella of the Parthenon and of the doric stoa of the Asklepieion. The street would then enter the Roman Market (Fig. 4).⁵⁸

A new scenario has been introduced by recent studies and investigations in the same area, conducted by

53 Vanderpool 1974. The term *agora* is used by Pausanias only one other time in I.17.1. For the description of the Kerameikos (i.e. 'The Athenian Agora' as excavated by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens): I.3–16.

54 The structure of Pausanias' text: I.16, end of the description of the Kerameikos Agora; I.17.1, *agora* with the Altar of Eleos and other things; I.17.2 Gymnasium of Ptolemy and (I.17.2–6) Theseion; I.18.1, Anakeion; I.18.2, Aglaurion; I.18.3, Prytaneion; I.18.4, Serapeion; I.18.5, Temple of Eileithyia; I.18.6, sanctuary of Olympian Zeus.

55 Miller 1995, 203–206. For the stoa: Di Cesare 2014e; for the so-called

Agoranomion: Malacrino 2014b.

56 Lippolis 1995, 47–51. For the building and the preceding architectural phases see Dontas 1969; D. Sourlas 2013, 155 n. 29; 160–161, 162 n. 50; Malacrino 2014a; Karvonis 2016, 141–142 (7: D2, 3, 10–12, 20); Di Cesare 2018.

57 Hoff 1994.

58 Korres 1994, 140–145; Korres 2009, 75 fig. 4, 1; 85–93. These same architectural members were previously assigned by Miller to a colonnaded courtyard: Miller 1995, 208–209, 232–233.



Fig. 2 The area to the east of the Roman Agora: the arched façade (interior view) that lead into the columned street (so-called Agoranomion).



Fig. 3 Roman Building along Adrianou Street, northern front and inner piers.

Manolis Korres and Dimitris Sourlas, which have revealed the existence of a marble propylon of Ionic order west of the Tower of Winds and probably antedating the latter.⁵⁹ Further research will clarify whether this propylon corresponds to the entrance of a gymnasium which eventually incorporated the Tower of the Winds, or to some monumental layout whose purpose is still to be explained (Fig. 5).⁶⁰

Some points may be stressed here. First, the general,

coherent orientation of the structures does not mean that they are part of a single complex; instead, it is justified by the orography and the artificial terracing of the area at the lower northern slopes of the Acropolis. Such a terracing is recognizable from the east, where a massive retaining wall has been found in Tripodon Street, to the west, where a similar wall has recently been brought to light by the Ephoreia in Dioskouron Street.⁶¹ Second, the structures found in the area belong to different

⁵⁹ Korres 2009, 86–88, fig. 4, 11–13; D. Sourlas 2013, 160–162. The structure, Hellenistic in date, was previously interpreted as an exedra.

⁶⁰ Korres 2009, fig. 4, 13: “πρόπυλον γυμνασίου (?)”; D. Sourlas 2013, 162 and n. 50; D. S. Sourlas 2015, 313; see also Saladino 2012, 176–178, for the attribution of the propylon to the Gymnasium of Ptolemy, reconstructed as a two-level complex including the Hellenistic stoa and (at a

higher level) the so-called Agoranomion. The arched façade would date back to the Hellenistic period (for comparisons with a gymnasium in Delos and other Hellenistic examples see Saladino 2012, 176–178, n. 90–99).

⁶¹ *Analemma* in Tripodon Street: Di Cesare 2011; *analemma* in Dioskouron 5; Tsoniotis 2007 [2014].




Fig. 4 Reconstruction of the area to the east of the Roman Agora according to Korres 1994.




Fig. 5 The area to the east of the Roman Agora according to recent excavations; ΠΠΠΓ: former exedra, now interpreted as a propylon.

phases, dating at least from the second century BC to the second century AD. The long stoas flanking the street to the east of the so-called Agoranomion (the foundations of one survive), for instance, may be explained as an Attalid gift, while the huge Hadrianic building, instead of being a remodeling of an existing complex, is likely to have been an entirely new structure which overlaid late Hellenistic and proto-imperial structures.

When trying to identify the archaeological evidence of the area from the Roman Agora to the Aglaurion (and surroundings) with the help of the literary sources, it should be recalled that Pausanias used selective criteria and did not describe the entire architectural heritage visible in his days, nor is the archaeological record complete. Thus it is not easy to make two different and incomplete series of literary and archaeological data coincide. Without independent proof for the identification (inscriptions or artefacts implying the function of a space or a building), it is not possible to label all the archaeological remains in the modern Plaka.

There is little doubt, however, that the general area for the search of the Ptolemaion is that between the Roman Market and the Aglaurion. Through terracing, in fact, the entire district at the bottom of the Acropolis would be suitable for building. Arrangements on multiple levels are best detectable in the columned street, which runs higher than the level ground of the first floor of the Hellenistic stoa and of the Tower of the Winds.

Apart from monumental architecture, most of the northern quarters inside the walls, pertaining to the demes of Kydathenaion and Skambonidai, were taken up by houses. The large quarter west of the second century BC Tower of the Winds was a market area, with houses, shops, streets and free open space:⁶² an extension of the Agora proper, whose functions were later inherited by the Roman Market.

Without attempting to suggest a hypothetical location for the Ptolemaion, it will suffice to identify the urban space in which it was situated, and that is somewhere to the east of the Roman Agora (Pl. 1). The spot close to the foot of the Acropolis cannot be entirely ruled out either, in keeping with both the route of Pausanias and the



Fig. 6 The so-called Post-Herulian Wall adjoining the dismantled section near Ag. Dimitrios Katiphoris.

terracing that has been attested, from at least the Classical age, for the Acropolis slopes.⁶³

Turning to the Diogeneion, it is necessary to deal with the inner Late Antique *teichos*, the so-called Post-Herulian Wall, a long section of which was dismantled in 1861 near the already demolished church of Ag. Dimitrios Katiphoris.⁶⁴ The wall was built from second-hand material, which was architectural as well as epigraphical and sculptural. Inscribed blocks and herm shafts were used in the two faces of the wall, while many portrait-heads, removed from their shaft, were used to fill the interior (Fig. 6).

The majority of the notable finds consisted of ephebic catalogues, honorary decrees and other epigraphic material pertaining to the *ephebeia*; the herms ranged from the Julio-Claudian period to AD 260 and, aside from a few ephebes, supported portraits of the *kosmetai* and other officials (*antikosmetai*, *sophronistai*, *paidotribai*). As stated above, many documents mentioned the Diogeneion; some mentioned the Ptolemaion, and others the Theseion.⁶⁵ Originally exposed in the *temenos* of the hero, catalogues of winners at the Theseia were in fact found in the wall.

P. Graindor observed that both gymnasia and the Theseion should not be sought very far by the findspot of the inscriptions. The second-hand materials were in fact

62 According to recent research, Kienast 2014, the Tower (which had exterior sun-dials) was internally a sort of planetarium viz. a model of the firmament.

63 See for instance Travlos 1971, 577 fig. 722, no. T-V; Hoepfner 2006, 15 fig. 13. Terracing walls are recorded by 18th century scholars in the area near the Church of Ag. Anargyroi, and others are still visible today in

the surroundings of Ag. Nikolaos Rangavas; Lippolis 1995, 55–56; Longo 2011, 519–523.

64 Graindor 1915, 241–244; Krumeich 2004, 133–138; Di Cesare 2014a.

65 Ptolemaion: IG II² 1041, 23; 1043.50; Theseion: IG II² 956, 16; 957, 11; 958, 14.



Fig. 7 Honorary stele for a kosmetes, 139/140 AD (EAM 1484; IG II² 2044), found in the Post-Herulian Wall near Agios Dimitrios Katiphoris.

built in the lower courses of the wall as they were used first, and before the builders could draw material elsewhere. Contrasting this view, G. Guidi stated that the source of all the ephebic material was the Agora, where many ephebic inscriptions were also found, connected

in part with the same late fortification circuit near the Church of Panagia Pyrgiotissa, built into a tower of the wall.⁶⁶

What is undeniable is the massive number of ephebic inscriptions and portraits from the lower courses of the wall near Agios Dimitrios; they are also consistent in chronology, ranging from the first century BC to the third century AD (Fig. 7). What were the consequences of the Herulian sack of AD 267 on the city? According to common belief, the materials removed from the destroyed gymnasia were built into the wall soon after; recent studies try to postpone the construction of the wall, dating it to the sixth century AD if not later.⁶⁷ If so, the ephebic epigraphic *corpus*, which seems to end in the last quarter of the third century AD, would have been left lying around somewhere for a very long time before being re-used. The association of the ephebic material from Ptolemaion, Diogeneion and Theseion is a reasonable argument to locate the Diogeneion not far away from Agios Dimitrios and also the old city centre, in which the ephebes had been at home for some centuries. It is not possible to ascertain if the Diogeneion adjoined the Ptolemaion, or if it was in the environs; a location outside the Post-Herulian Wall, not far from the Eridanos River, could also well suit a gymnasium.

The search for the Diogeneion in the proximity of Agios Dimitrios has not given results: A. Koumanoudis, after dismantling the Post-Herulian Wall, extended the excavation but could not find anything relevant; P. Pervanoglou, some years later, wrote of ancient columns in a nearby house.⁶⁸ Recent archaeological investigations in the site of Agios Dimitrios by the University of Athens has exposed the ruins of a building made of re-employed blocks, perhaps of Roman date.⁶⁹

4 Conclusion: the historical and urbanistic meaning of the new Hellenistic gymnasia

The three old Athenian gymnasia embodied the ideology and the values of the archaic and classical polis, when the gymnasium culture was rooted in the firm con-

⁶⁶ Guidi 1921–1922, followed by Delorme 1960, 144–145.

⁶⁷ For the chronological problem see Di Cesare and Marchiandi 2014. An up-to-date overview of the archaeological data for the Post-Herulian Wall in Tsoniotis 2008; Tsoniotis 2016; for the lower dating compare Bazzocchi

and Baldini 2016, 707–709.

⁶⁸ *Γενική συνέλευσις* 1863 [1864], 7; Pervanoglou 1866, 160–161, no. 208.

⁶⁹ <http://chronique.efa.gr/app/webroot/index.php/fiches/voir/84> (visited on 11/12/2017) (Touchais).

nection between soldier and good citizen.

The new Hellenistic gymnasia reflected a different image of the city. They were embedded in the political situation following the liberation from Macedonian rule in 229 BC and with the guarantee of enduring freedom by the Egyptian King Ptolemy III Euergetes. The ancient heroes and gods were replaced by political authorities: a strict link was established between gymnasium and *Herrscherkult*, enhanced by the central location of the complexes.

The building of the new gymnasia in the *asty*, rather than on the outskirts of the city, bore a great impact on a symbolic and practical level. As can be observed in the case of the Roman Market and of the Library of Hadrian, construction would have required the expropriation of private houses followed by demolition and levelling operations.

Even though a convincing, albeit approximate, location can be advocated only for the Ptolemaion, the Diogeneion should not be sought very far. Both complexes were intentionally linked to the civic and sacral core of the archaic city in the deme Kydathenaion, the so-called Old Agora of Athens, which housed the ancient headquarters of the archons, the sacred heart of the polis (the Prytaneion), as well as the *temenos* of the hero-founder of the Athenian institutions.⁷⁰ The Theseion and the nearby Anakeion (the sanctuary of the Dioskouroi) were large open spaces appropriate for summoning hoplites (i.e. the *laos* of the Archaic city) and horsemen. For centuries, all this area at the feet of the Aglaurion had martial associations, and even when the agora was moved to

the Ceramicus, perhaps at the end of the sixth century BC,⁷¹ it persisted as one of the main representative nuclei of the polis.

The same urban spaces were traditionally associated with the *ephebeia*. Theseus was the archetype of the young men training in order to become citizens: the ephebes swore at the Aglaurion, while in the adjoining theatre they received a shield and a spear from the city and took part in a military parade. Accordingly, the Ptolemaion and the Diogeneion were archaistically connected with the glorious past of the city and its monumental and urbanistic cornerstones. That is clear for the Ptolemaion, in close proximity to the Theseion and the 'Old Agora'

By the end of the fourth century BC ephebate was no longer compulsory, and its prime military nature evolved mostly into physical training, general learning and religious duties. Hellenistic inscriptions feature the ephebes regularly frequenting the gymnasia of the polis and involved in processions, sacrifices, torch-races and participating in other contests during various Athenian festivals, including the Panathenaia, the City Dionysia, the Theseia and the Epitaphia.⁷² Rising when the *ephebeia* had become an aristocratic 'club' and the old polis a nostalgic memory, the new gymnasia re-enacted, if only symbolically, the cardinal values of the ancient polis, such as the *eleutheria* and the defense of the Attic borders, developing into athletic, philosophical and literary schools, which contributed to the urbanistic renovation as well as at the transformation of Athens into a glamorous university.

70 Di Cesare 2015a, 166–168; Di Cesare 2015b, 77–95.



71 As advocated by the *horoi* (IG I³ 1087–1089), dating to ca. 510–500 BC.

72 Pélékidis 1962, 211–256; Mikalson 1998, 242–249, 292–293; Burkhardt 2004, 200–202; Chaniotis 2005, 47–55, 237–240; Kyle 2015, 234–236. For


ephebes in "the gymnasia" of the city see e.g. SEG 26, 98.14 (late third century BC); IG II² 1006, 16, 60, 75 (122/121 BC); 1028.12, 34 (100/99 BC); 1043.43 (38/37 BC).



Pl. 1 General plan of ancient Athens: the central area, with the main evidence discussed in the text: 1. The Athenian Agora (Pausanias's Kerameikos); 2. Section of the Post-Herulian Wall in the Agora and Church of Pyrgiotissa; 3. Hellenistic houses and shops under the Roman Agora and Hadrian's Library; 4. Library of Hadrian; 5. Roman Agora (Pausanias's agora of I.17.1–2); 6. Tower of the Winds; 7. Hellenistic Stoa; 8. Arched façade and columned street (so-called Agoranomion); 9. Site of the terracing wall recently discovered in Dioskouron Street; 10. Hadrianic building above Hellenistic and Early Roman structures along Adrianou Street; 11. Post-Herulian wall: section dismantled in 1861; 12. Location of the demolished church of Agios Dimitrios Katiphoris; 13. Church of Ag. Anargyroi and site of ancient terracing walls; 14. Church of Ag. Nikolaos Rangavas and nearby terracing walls; 15. Retaining wall of Late Classical/Hellenistic Age in Tripodon Street 20–32; 16. Cave of Aglauros; 17. Ancient Tripodes Street; 18. Olympieion. Highlighted areas in the circles: OA. Supposed site of the so-called Old Agora (with the Prytaneion, the Theseion, and the Anakeion); PT. Supposed area in which the Ptolemaion was located; D. Supposed site of the Diogeneion.



Pl. 2 Different proposals for the sites of the Ptolemaion and the Diogeneion: D – Diogeneion; GoP – Gymnasium of Ptolemy; P – Pantheon; RA – Roman Agora. 1 Travlos 1971; 2 DNP s.v. Athenai. II. Topographie (H. R. Goette) (OA: approximate site of the Ptolemaion, the Theseion and the Old Agora).



Pl. 3 Different proposals for the sites of the Ptolemaion and the Diogeneion: D – Diogeneion; GoP – Gymnasium of Ptolemy; LoH – Library of Hadrian; P – Pantheon; RA – Roman Agora; T – Theseion. 1 Hoepfner 2006; 2 Lippolis 2006; 3 Miller2005.

Bibliography

Arenz 2006

Alexander Arenz. *Herakleides Kritikos 'Über die Städte in Hellas'. Eine Periegeese Griechenlands am Vorabend des Chremonideischen Krieges*. Munich: Utz, 2006.

Bazzechi and Baldini 2016

Elisa Bazzechi and Isabella Baldini. "About the Meaning of Fortifications in Late Antique Athens: The Case of Athens in Context". In *Focus on Fortifications. New Research on Fortifications in the Ancient Mediterranean and the Near East*. Ed. by R. Frederiksen, S. Muth, P. Schneider, and M. Schnelle. Oxford: Oxbow, 2016, 696–711.

Billot 1989

Marie-Françoise Billot. "Académie: Topographie et archéologie". In *Dictionnaire des Philosophes antiques, Vol. I*. Ed. by R. Goulet. Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1989, 693–789.

Billot 1994

Marie-Françoise Billot. "Le Cynosarges, histoire, mythes et archéologie". In *Dictionnaire des Philosophes antiques, Vol. II*. Ed. by R. Goulet. Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1994, 917–966.

Brenk 2007

Frederick E. Brenk. "School and Literature. The Gymnasia at Athens in the First Century A.D." In *With Unperfumed Voice: Studies in Plutarch, in Greek Literature, Religion and Philosophy, and in the New Testament Background*. Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 21. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2007, 237–254.

Bringmann 2000

Klaus Bringmann. *Geben und Nehmen. Monarchische Wohltätigkeit und Selbstdarstellung im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2000.

Bringmann and Steuben 1995

Klaus Bringmann and Hans von Steuben, eds. *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995.

Burkhardt 2004

Leonhard Burkhardt. "Die attische Ephebie in hellenistischer Zeit". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel 8. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 193–206.

Camp 2010

John McKesson II Camp. *The Athenian Agora: Site Guide*. Princeton, NJ: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2010.

Caruso 2013

Ada Caruso. *Akademia: Archeologia di una scuola filosofica ad Atene da Platone a Proclo (387 a.C.–485 d.C.)*. Studi di Archeologia e di Topografia di Atene e dell' Attica 6. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos and Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2013.

Chaniotis 2005

Angelos Chaniotis. *War in the Hellenistic world: A Social and Cultural History*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005.

Chaniotis 2008

Angelos Chaniotis. "Policing the Hellenistic Countryside. Realities and Ideologie". In *Sécurité collective et ordre public dans les sociétés anciennes. Sept exposés suivis de discussions*. Ed. by H. van Wees, C. Brélaz, and P. Ducrey. Genève: Fondation Hardt, 2008, 103–145.

Chankowski 2014

Andrzej S. Chankowski. "L'éphébie athénienne antérieure à la réforme d'Epikratès : à propos de Reinmuth, Eph.Inscr. 1 et de la chronologie des premières inscriptions éphébiques". *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 138 (2014), 15–78.

Clay 1977

Diskin Clay. "A Gymnasium Inventory from the Athenian Agora". *Hesperia* 46 (1977), 259–267.

Delorme 1960

Jean Delorme. *Gymnasion: étude sur les monuments consacrés à l'éducation en Grèce (des origines à l'Empire romain)*. Paris: De Boccard, 1960.

Di Cesare 2011

Riccardo Di Cesare. "Il muro di 'analemma' in od. Tripodon". In *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.*, 2. Colline sud-occidentali e Valle dell'Ilisso. Ed. by E. Greco, F. Longo, D. Marchiandi, M. C. Monaco, R. Di Cesare, and G. Marginesu. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos, Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, Atene, and Paestum, 2011, 547–549.

Di Cesare 2014a

Riccardo Di Cesare. "I tratti delle mura cd. posterule presso la Chiesa di Hag. Dimitrios Katiforis". In *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.* 3. Quartieri a nord e a nord-est dell'Acropoli e Agora del Ceramico. Ed. by E. Greco, R. Di Cesare, F. Longo, and D. Marchiandi. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos, Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, Atene, and Paestum, 2014, 745–749.

Di Cesare 2014b

Riccardo Di Cesare. "Il Diogheneion". In *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.* 3. Quartieri a nord e a nord-est dell'Acropoli e Agora del Ceramico. Ed. by E. Greco, R. Di Cesare, F. Longo, and D. Marchiandi. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos, Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, Atene, and Paestum, 2014, 752–753.

Di Cesare 2014c

Riccardo Di Cesare. "L'area a nord dell'Acropoli. Quadro generale storico-topografico". In *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.*, 3. Quartieri a nord e a nord-est dell'Acropoli e Agora del Ceramico. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos and Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2014, 709–743.

Di Cesare 2014d

Riccardo Di Cesare. "Lo Ptolemaion". In *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.* 3. Quartieri a nord e a nord-est dell'Acropoli e Agora del Ceramico. Ed. by E. Greco, R. Di Cesare, F. Longo, and D. Marchiandi. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos, Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, Atene, and Paestum, 2014, 749–751.

Di Cesare 2014e

Riccardo Di Cesare. "Portico(i) di età ellenistica lungo il cd. 'Agoranomio'". In *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.* 3. Quartieri a nord e a nord-est dell'Acropoli e Agora del Ceramico. Ed. by E. Greco, R. Di Cesare, F. Longo, and D. Marchiandi. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos, Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, Atene, and Paestum, 2014, 762–765.

Di Cesare 2015a

Riccardo Di Cesare. "A Short History of the Athenian Agorai". In *ΑΡΧΙΤΕΚΤΩΝ. Τιμητικός τόμος για τον καθηγητή Μανώλη Κορρέ*. Ed. by K. Zampas, V. Lambrinoudakis, and E. Simantoni-Bournia. Melissa, 2015, 163–174.

Di Cesare 2015b

Riccardo Di Cesare. *La città di Cecrope. Ricerche sulla politica edilizia cimoniana ad Atene*. Studi di Archeologia e di Topografia di Atene e dell' Attica 11. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos; Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2015.

Di Cesare 2018

Riccardo Di Cesare. "Το Κτήριο της οδού Αδριανού – L'Edificio di od. Adrianou – The Building of od. Adrianou". In *Hadrianus. Αδριανός. Ο Αδριανός, η Αθήνα και τα Γυμνάσια – Adriano, Atene e i Ginnasi – Hadrian, Athens and the Gymnasia*. Ed. by M. Lagogianni-Georgakarakos and E. Papi. Athens: National Archaeological Museum and Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2018, 114–115.

Di Cesare and Marchiandi 2014

Riccardo Di Cesare and Daniela Marchiandi. "Il muro cd. posterulo". In *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.* 3. Quartieri a nord e a nord-est dell'Acropoli e Agora del Ceramico. Ed. by E. Greco, R. Di Cesare, F. Longo, and D. Marchiandi. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos and Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2014, 1138–1139.

Di Nicuolo 2014

Carmelo Di Nicuolo. "Palestre dell'Atene in età classica e tardoclassica". In *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.* 3. Quartieri a nord e a nord-est dell'Acropoli e Agora del Ceramico. Ed. by E. Greco, R. Di Cesare, F. Longo, and D. Marchiandi. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos and Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2014, 670–672.

Dontas 1969

George Dontas. "Οικόπεδον ἀδελφῶν Ψαρίδη ἐπὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ Ἀδριανού". *Archaiologikon Deltion* 24 B (1969), 19–23.

Dow 1958

Sterling Dow. "Οἱ περὶ τὸ Διογένηιον". *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 63 (1958), 423–436.

Dow 1960

Sterling Dow. "The Athenian Ephēboi. Other Staffs, and the Staff of the Diogeneion". *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 91 (1960), 381–409.

Ferguson 1911

William Scott Ferguson. *Hellenistic Athens: An Historical Essay*. London: Macmillan & Co., 1911.

Frantz 1979

Alison Frantz. "A Public Building of Late Antiquity in Athens (IG II2, 5205)". *Hesperia* 48 (1979), 194–203.

Gauthier 1995

Paul Gauthier. "Notes sur le rôle du gymnase dans les cités hellénistiques". In *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus. Kolloquium, München 24. bis 26. Juni 1993*. Ed. by M. Wörle and P. Zanker. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995, 1–11.

Goette 1997

Hans R. Goette. "Athenai". In *Der Neue Pauly*. Vol. 2. Stuttgart and Weimar: Metzler, 1997, 167–186.

Graindor 1915

Paul Graindor. "Les cosmètes du Musée d'Athènes". *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 39 (1915), 241–401.

Graindor 1922

Paul Graindor. *Marbres et textes antiques d'époque impériale*. Gand: Rysselberghe and Rombaut, 1922.

Greco, Di Cesare, et al. 2014

Emanuele Greco, Riccardo Di Cesare, Fausto Longo, and Daniela Marchiandi, eds. *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.* 3. Quartieri a nord e a nord-est dell'Acropoli e Agora del Ceramico. Studi di Archeologia e di Topografia di Atene e dell' Attica 1.3. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos and Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2014.

Greco, Longo, et al. 2011

Emanuele Greco, Fausto Longo, Daniela Marchiandi, Maria Chiara Monaco, Riccardo Di Cesare, and Giovanni Marginesu, eds. *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.* 2. Colline sud-occidentali e Valle dell'Ilisso. Studi di Archeologia e di Topografia di Atene e dell' Attica 1.2. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos and Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2011.

Guidi 1921–1922

Giacomo Guidi. “Il muro valeriano a S. Demetrio Katiphori e la questione del Diogeneion”. *Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni italiane in Oriente* 3–4 (1921–1922), 35–54.

Habicht 1982

Christian Habicht. *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.

Habicht 1995

Christian Habicht. *Athen: die Geschichte der Stadt in hellenistischer Zeit*. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995.

von Hesberg 1995

Henner von Hesberg. “Das griechische Gymnasium im 2. Jh. v. Chr.” In *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus. Kolloquium, München 24. bis 26. Juni 1993*. Ed. by M. Wörle and P. Zanker. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995, 13–27.

Hoepfner 2006

Wolfram Hoepfner. “Die griechische Agora im Überblick”. In *Die griechische Agora, Bericht über ein Kolloquium*. Ed. by W. Hoepfner and L. Lehman. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2006.

Hoff 1994

Michael Hoff. “Athenian Agora”. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (1994), 93–117.

von den Hoff 1994

Ralf von den Hoff. *Philosophenporträts des Früh- und Hochhellenismus*. Munich: Biering & Brinkmann, 1994.

von den Hoff 2009

Ralf von den Hoff. “Hellenistische Gymnasia. Raumgestaltung und Raumfunktionen”. In *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus*. Ed. by A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann. Munich: Verlag Antike, 2009, 245–275.

Judeich 1931

Walther Judeich. *Topographie von Athen*. 2nd ed. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 3. Abt. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1931.

Kah and Scholz 2004

Daniel Kah and Peter Scholz, eds. *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004.

Kalligas 2009

Petros Kalligas. “Το Παναθηναϊκό στάδιο. Μια νέα ερμηνεία”. *Archaiologia & Technes* 113 (2009), 86–95.

Karvonis 2016

Pavlos Karvonis. *Tabula Imperii Romani. J 34 – Athens. Attica*. *Tabula Imperii Romani J 34*. Athens: Academy of Athens, 2016.

Kazakidi 2015

Natalia Kazakidi. *Εικόνες έν γυμνασίω. Έργα γλυπτικής στο Ελληνιστικό Γυμνάσιο*. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 2015.

Kennell 2006

Nigel M. Kennell. *Ephebeia: A Register of Greek Cities with Citizen Training Systems in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Hildesheim: Weidmann, 2006.

Kennell 2015

Nigel M. Kennell. “The Ephebeia in the Hellenistic Period”. In *A Companion to Ancient Education*. Ed. by W. M. Bloomer. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2015, 172–183.

Kienast 2014

Hermann J. Kienast. *Der Turm der Winde in Athen*. *Archäologische Forschungen* 30. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2014.

Korres 1994

Manolis Korres. “The Parthenon from Antiquity to the 19th Century”. In *The Parthenon and Its Impact in Modern Times*. Ed. by P. Tournikiotis. Athens: Melissa, 1994, 136–161.

Korres 2009

Manolis Korres. “Οδικό δίκτυο γύρω από την Ακρόπολη”. In *Αττικής οδοί. Αρχαίοι δρόμοι της Αττικής*. Ed. by M. Korres. Athens: Melissa, 2009, 74–95.

Korres 2015

Manolis Korres. *The Odeion Roof of Herodes Atticus and Other Giant Spans*. Athens: Melissa, 2015.

Kotsidu 2000

Haritini Kotsidu. *Τμή και δόξα. Εbrungen für hellenistische Herrscher im griechischen Mutterland und in Kleinasien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der archäologischen Denkmäler*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2000.

Krumeich 2004

Ralf Krumeich. “‘Klassiker’ im Gymnasium. Bildnisse attischer Kosmeten der mittleren und späten Kaiserzeit zwischen Rom und griechischer Vergangenheit”. In *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*. Ed. by B. E. Borg. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2004, 131–155.

Kyle 1987

Donald G. Kyle. *Athletics in Ancient Athens*. *Mnemosyne Supplement* 95. Leiden: Brill, 1987.

Kyle 2015

Donald G. Kyle. *Sport and Spectacle in the Ancient World*. 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2015.

Lagogianni-Georgakarakos and Papi 2018

M. Lagogianni-Georgakarakos and E. Papi, eds. Athens: National Archaeological Museum and Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2018.

Lattanzi 1968

Elena Lattanzi. *I ritratti dei cosmeti del Museo Nazionale di Atene*. *Studia Archaeologica* 9. Rome: L’Erma di Breitschneider, 1968.

Lauter 1986

Hans Lauter. *Die Architektur des Hellenismus*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1986.

M. Levensohn and E. Levensohn 1947

Mitchell Levensohn and Ethel Levensohn. “Inscriptions on the South Slope of the Acropolis”. *Hesperia* 16 (1947), 63–74.

Lippolis 1995

Enzo Lippolis. “Tra il ginnasio di Tolomeo e il Serapeion. La ricostruzione topografica di un quartiere monumentale di Atene”. *Ostraka* 4 (1995), 43–67.

Lippolis 2006

Enzo Lippolis. "Lo spazio per votare e altre note di topografia sulle agorai di Atene". *Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni italiane in Oriente* 84 (2006), 37–62.

Longo 2011

Fausto Longo. "Tra l'Olympieion e l'Acropoli. Quadro generale storico-topografico". In *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.* 2. Colline sud-occidentali e Valle dell'Ilisso. Ed. by E. Greco, F. Longo, D. Marchiandi, M. C. Monaco, R. Di Cesare, and G. Marginesu. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos and Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2011, 511–523.

Longo 2014

Fausto Longo. "L'Agora del Ceramico e il Kolonos Agoraios". In *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.* 3. Quartieri a nord e a nord-est dell'Acropoli e Agora del Ceramico. Ed. by E. Greco, R. Di Cesare, F. Longo, and D. Marchiandi. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos and Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2014, 849–894.

Lynch 1972

John P. Lynch. *Aristotle's School: A Study of a Greek Educational Institution*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.

Ma 2008

John Ma. "The Inventory SEG XXVI 139, and the Athenian Asklepeion". *Tekmeria* 9 (2008), 7–16.

Malacrino 2014a

Carmelo G. Malacrino. "L'Edificio di od. Adrianou (cd. 'Pantheon')". In *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.* 3. Quartieri a nord e a nord-est dell'Acropoli e Agora del Ceramico. Ed. by E. Greco, D. Marchiandi, M. C. Monaco, R. Di Cesare, and F. Longo. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos, Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, Atene, and Paestum, 2014, 753–756.

Malacrino 2014b

Carmelo G. Malacrino. "Le strutture ad est dell'Agora Romana: il cd. 'Agoranomion'". In *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.* 3. Quartieri a nord e a nord-est dell'Acropoli e Agora del Ceramico. Ed. by E. Greco, D. Marchiandi, M. C. Monaco, R. Di Cesare, and F. Longo. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos and Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2014, 759–761.

Marchetti 2012

Patrick Marchetti. "Métamorphoses de l'agora d'Athènes à l'époque augustéenne". In *Basiliques et agoras de Grece et d'Asie Mineure*. Ed. by L. Cavalier, R. Descat, and J. des Courtis. Bordeaux: Ausonius, 2012, 207–223.

Marchiandi 2014a

Daniela Marchiandi. "Il ginnasio dell'Accademia". In *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.* 4. Ceramico, *Dipylon* e Accademia. Ed. by E. Greco, D. Marchiandi, M. C. Monaco, R. Di Cesare, and F. Longo. Pandemos and Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2014, 1480–1491.

Marchiandi 2014b

Daniela Marchiandi. "Il Liceo, il santuario di Apollo, il ginnasio, il Kepos di Teofrasto". In *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.* 3. Quartieri a nord e a nord-est dell'Acropoli e Agora del Ceramico. Ed. by E. Greco, R. Di Cesare, F. Longo, and D. Marchiandi. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos and Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2014, 698–702.

Meritt 1947

Benjamin Meritt. "Greek Inscriptions". *Hesperia* 16 (1947), 147–183.

Mikalson 1998

Jon D. Mikalson. *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Miller 1995

Stephen G. Miller. "Architecture as Evidence for the Identity of the Early Polis". In *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State (Symposium 24–27 1994)*. Ed. by M. H. Hansen. Copenhagen: Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, 1995, 201–244.

Monaco 2013a

Maria Chiara Monaco. "Allenare i giovani, fare filosofia nei giardini, venerare gli dei, produrre ceramica, seppellire i morti: considerazioni preliminari sul proasteion di Atene in età classica". In *PROASTEION. Recherches sur le périurbain dans le monde grec*. Ed. by D. Pascal, E. Roland, and A.-M. Guimier-Sorbets. Paris: De Boccard, 2013, 31–61.

Monaco 2013b

Maria Chiara Monaco. "Senza templi, tra una casa e una bottega. Note di topografia del sacro nell'Atene di età classica". In *Sacrum facere, Atti del I Seminario di Archeologia del Sacro (Trieste, 17–18 febbraio 2012)*. Ed. by F. Fontana. Trieste: Editrice Università di Trieste, 2013, 95–118.

Newby 2005

Zahra Newby. *Greek Athletics in the Roman World: Victory and Virtue*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Oikonomides 1964

Alkibiades N. Oikonomides. *The Two Agoras in Ancient Greece*. Chicago: Argonaut, 1964.

Pélékidis 1962

Chrysis Pélékidis. *Histoire de l'éphébie attique des origines à 31 avant Jésus-Christ*. Paris: De Boccard, 1962.

Pervanoglou 1866

P. Pervanoglou. "Theseus und Minotaur". *Archäologische Zeitung* 24.208 (1866), 160–161.

Privitera 2011a

Santo Privitera. "Gli edific presso la cheisa di Hag. Panteleimon: il cd. Ginnasio di Cinosarge". In *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.* 2. Colline sud-occidentali e Valle dell'Ilisso. Ed. by E. Greco, F. Longo, M. C. Monaco, R. Di Cesare, D. Marchiandi, and G. Marginesu. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos, Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, Atene, and Paestum, 2011, 503–506.

Privitera 2011b

Santo Privitera. "Il Cinosarge: il Santuario di Eracle, il ginnasio e gli Herakleia di Diomeia". In *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.*, 2. Colline sud-occidentali e Valle dell'Ilisso. Ed. by E. Greco, F. Longo, M. C. Monaco, R. Di Cesare, D. Marchiandi, and G. Marginesu. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos, Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, Atene, and Paestum, 2011, 508–509.

Reinmuth 1959

Oscar W. Reinmuth. "A Diogenes' College in Athens?" *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 90 (1959), 209–223.

Reinmuth 1962

Oscar W. Reinmuth. "Hoi Peri to Diogeneion Again". *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 93 (1962), 374–388.

Remijsen 2015

Sophie Remijsen. *The End of Greek Athletics in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Saladino 2012

Vincenzo Saladino. "La Torre dei Venti. Motivi e scopi della sua costruzione". *Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni italiane in Oriente* 90 (2012), 167–195.

Santaniello 2011

Emanuela Santaniello. "L'Olympieion". In *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.*, 2. Colline sud-occidentali e Valle dell'Ilisso. Ed. by E. Greco, F. Longo, M. C. Monaco, R. Di Cesare, D. Marchiandi, and G. Marginesu. Athens and Paestum: Pandemos and Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2011, 458–463.

Scarcella 1995

Antonio M. Scarcella. "L'efebia di Plutarco". In *Seconda miscelanea filologica*. Ed. by I. Gallo. Quaderni del Dipartimento di Scienze delle Antichità, Università di Salerno. Naples: Arte Tipografica, 1995, 121–130.

Schaaf 1992

Hildegard Schaaf. *Untersuchungen zu Gebäuestiftungen in hellenistischer Zeit*. Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau, 1992.

Schmidt-Dounas 2000

Barbara Schmidt-Dounas. *Geschenke erhalten die Freundschaft: Politik und Selbstdarstellung im Spiegel der Monumente*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2000.

Scholz 2004

Peter Scholz. "Elementar Unterricht und intellektuelle Bildung im hellenistischen Gymnasium". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 103–128.

D. S. Sourlas 2015

Dimitri S. Sourlas. "Ανέκδοτη επιγραφή Θησειδών από την Αθήνα". In *ΑΞΩΝ. Studies in Honor of Ronald S. Stroud*, A. Ed. by A. Matthaiou and N. Papazarkadas. Athens: Ελληνική Επιγραφική Εταιρεία, 2015, 299–322.

D. Sourlas 2013

Dimitris Sourlas. "Πρόσφατες Αρχαιολογικές έρευνες στη Ρωμαϊκή Αγορά, στη Βιβλιοθήκη του Αδριανού και της όμορης περιοχής". In *Αρχαιολογικές Συμβολές τόμος Β: Αττική. Α' και Β' Εφορείες Προϊστορικών & Κλασικών Αρχαιοτήτων*. Ed. by S. Oikonomou and M. Donka-Toli. Athens: Μουσείο Κυκλαδικής Τέχνης, 2013, 149–168.

D. Sourlas 2014

Dimitris Sourlas. "The Monument within the Monument. Preliminary of the Excavation at the Aiolos Hotel in Placa". In *Gli Ateniesi e il loro modello di città*. Ed. by L. M. Calio, E. Lippolis, and V. Parisi. Rome: Quasar, 2014, 299–306.

D. Sourlas 2007 [2014]

Dimitris Sourlas. "Οδός Αδριανού 80 και Διογένηος 3". *Archaiologikon Deltion* 62 B (2007 [2014]), 79–81.

Thompson 1966

Homer A. Thompson. "Activity in the Athenian Agora 1960–1965". *Hesperia* 35 (1966), 37–54.

Thompson 1968

Homer A. Thompson. "Activities in the Athenian Agora: 1966–1967". *Hesperia* 37 (1968), 36–72.

Threpsiadis 1950

Ioannis Threpsiadis. "Ανασκαφαί νοτίως τῆς Ἀκροπόλεως". *Πρακτικά της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας* (1950), 64–121.

Travlos 1971

John Travlos. *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*. New York and Washington: Praeger, 1971.

Trombetti 2013

Catia Trombetti. *Il ginnasio greco. Genesi, topografia e culti dei luoghi della paideia*. British Archaeological Reports. International Series 2527. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2013.

Tsoniotis 2008

Nikos Tsoniotis. "Νέα στοιχεία για το υστερορωμαϊκό τείχος της Αθήνας". In *Η Αθήνα κατά τη Ρωμαϊκή εποχή. Πρόσφατες ανακαλύψεις, νέες έρευνες*. Ed. by S. Vlizos. Μουσείο Μπενάκη 40 Παράρτημα. Athens: Benaki Museum, 2008, 55–74.

Tsoniotis 2012

Nikos Tsoniotis. "La città antica a nord dell'Acropoli e le sue sopravvivenze nel paesaggio urbano di Atene contemporanea". In *Archeologia e città: riflessione sulla valorizzazione dei siti archeologici in aree urbane*. Ed. by A. Ancona, A. Contino, and R. Sebastiani. Rome: Palombi, 2012, 101–116.

Tsoniotis 2013

Nikos Tsoniotis. "Η ρωμαϊκή Αγορά της Αθηνas από την ύστερη αρχαιότητα έως την Τουρκοκρατία. Αρχαιολογική έρευνα, ανασκαφικά δεδομένα". In *Αρχαιολογικές Συμβολές τόμος Β: Αττική. Α' και Β' Εφορείες Προϊστορικών & Κλασικών Αρχαιοτήτων*. Ed. by S. Oikonomou and M. Donka-Toli. Athens: Μουσείο Κυκλαδικής Τέχνης, 2013, 169–192.

Tsoniotis 2014

Nikos Tsoniotis. “Lo scavo del lato est dell’Agorà romana di Atene (2000–2003): dati stratigrafici e risultati”. In *Gli Ateniesi e il loro modello di città*. Ed. by L. M. Calio, E. Lippolis, and V. Parisi. Rome: Quasar, 2014, 323–336.

Tsoniotis 2016

Nikos Tsoniotis. “The Benizeli Mansion Excavation: Latest evidence on the Post-Herulian Fortification Wall in Athens”. In *Focus on Fortifications. New Research on Fortifications in the Ancient Mediterranean and the Near East*. Ed. by R. Frederiksen, S. Müth, P. Schneider, and M. Schnelle. Oxford: Oxbow, 2016, 712–724.

Tsoniotis 2006 [2014]

Nikos Tsoniotis. “Βυβλοθήκη Αδριανού”. *Archaiologikon Deltion* 61 B (2006 [2014]), 61–68.

Tsoniotis 2007 [2014]

Nikos Tsoniotis. “Αθήνα”. *Archaiologikon Deltion* 62 B (2007 [2014]), 73–79.

Umholtz 1994

Gretchen Umholtz. “Royal Patronage of Greek Architecture as an Instrument of Foreign Policy in the Hellenistic Period”. PhD Thesis. 1994.

Vanderpool 1974

Eugene Vanderpool. “The ‘Agora’ of Pausania I 17, 1–2”. *Hesperia* 43 (1974), 308–310.

Vlachogianni 2018a

Elena Vlachogianni. “Κοσμητῆς και ἔφηβοι – Cosmeti ed efebi – Kosmetai and ephebes”. In *Hadrianus. Αδριανός. Ο Αδριανός, η Αθήνα και τα Γυμνάσια – Adriano, Atene e i Ginnasi – Hadrian, Athens and the Gymnasia*. Ed. by M. Lagogianni-Georgakarakos and E. Papi. Athens: National Archaeological Museum and Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2018, 158–161.

Vlachogianni 2018b

Elena Vlachogianni. “Το ‘Διογένειον’ και οι ερμαϊκές στήλες των ‘κοσμητῶν’ – Il ‘Diogeneion’ e le erme dei ‘cosmeti’ – The ‘Diogeneion’ and the herms of the ‘kosmetai’”. In *Hadrianus. Αδριανός. Ο Αδριανός, η Αθήνα και τα Γυμνάσια – Adriano, Atene e i Ginnasi – Hadrian, Athens and the Gymnasia*. Ed. by M. Lagogianni-Georgakarakos and E. Papi. Athens: National Archaeological Museum and Scuola Archeologica Italiana di Atene, 2018, 162–165.

Wacker 1996

Christian Wacker. *Das Gymnasium in Olympia. Geschichte und Funktion*. Würzburg: Ergon, 1996.

Wycherley 1957

Richard E. Wycherley. *Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia*. The Athenian Agora 3. Princeton, NY: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1957.

Illustration and plate credits

ILLUSTRATIONS: 1–3 Author. 4 Korres 1994, 143 fig. 8. 5 Korres 2009, 88 fig. 4.13. 6 Photo: Italian School of Archaeology at Athens, Archive, B/762-1921. 7 Lagogianni-Georgakarakos and Papi 2018, fig. at 238. **PLATES:** 1 R. Di

Cesare after Greco, Di Cesare, et al. 2014. 2 1 Travlos 1971, fig. at 577; 2 DNP s.v. Athenai. II. Topographie (H. R. Goette), fig. at 171–172. 3 1 Hoepfner 2006, 15, fig. 13 2 Lippolis 2006, 56, fig. 10. 3 Miller 1995, 244, fig. 2.

RICCARDO DI CESARE

is Professor of Greek and Mediterranean Archaeology at the University of Foggia. Formerly Research Fellow of the Italian Archaeological School at Athens (IASA), PhD at the Advanced Institute for Historical Studies (San Marino), he is a long-standing member of various research projects at the IASA, including *Topografia di Atene*. He is currently director of the archaeological excavations of the IASA/University of Foggia at the ‘tyrrhenian’ sanctuary on the archaic acropolis of Hephaistia (Lemnos) and co-director of the archaeological excavations of the University of Foggia at *Alba Fucens*.

Prof. Dr. Riccardo Di Cesare
Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici
Università di Foggia
Via Arpi 176
71121 Foggia, Italy
E-Mail: riccardo.dicesare@unifg.it

Natalia Kazakidi

The Posthumous Depiction of Youths in Late Hellenistic and Early Imperial Gymnasia

Summary

While the honorary practice in gymnasia has received significant attention in literature, posthumous honors and depictions of youths have not yet been studied comprehensively. The aim of this paper is to discuss this phenomenon. After a brief overview of the known repertoire of sculptural decoration in gymnasia, epigraphic evidence of posthumous honors for youths, who had trained in the gymnasium and died prematurely, is discussed. Focus is then on the identification of sculptures that, according to their context and iconography, may have served as posthumous depictions of youths, among them e.g. the statue of Kleoneikos from Eretria. It is argued that three different iconographic types were available: the naked, 'heroic' type, the himatiophoros type, and the herm.

Keywords: gymnasium; portraits; honorary statues; herms; posthumous honors

Dieser Beitrag untersucht posthume Ehrungen und Darstellungen von jungen Männern im Gymnasion, die in der Forschung bislang nicht umfassend untersucht worden sind. Nach einem Überblick über das bekannte Skulpturenrepertoire in Gymnasia werden die epigraphischen Quellen posthu-

mer Ehrungen von jungen Männern diskutiert, die im Gymnasion trainiert hatten und vorzeitig verstorben waren. Der Fokus liegt dann auf der Identifizierung von Skulpturen die, dem Kontext und der Ikonographie zufolge, als posthume Ehrungen von Jugendlichen gedient haben könnten. Darunter ist z.B. die Statue des Kleoneikos von Eretria. Es wird dargelegt, dass drei verschiedene ikonographische Typen für diese Ehrungen verwendet wurden: der nackte ‚heroische‘ Typ, der Himation-Typ und die Herme.

Keywords: Gymnasion; Porträts; Ehrenstatuen; Hermen; posthume Ehrungen

I would like to express my warmest thanks to the Editors Dr. Ulrich Mania and Prof. Monika Trümper for their kind invitation. I am also most grateful for the discussions I had with Profs Theodosia Stephanidou-Tiveriou, Emmanuel Voutyras, Panagiotis Nigdelis and Ralf von den Hoff. I also owe a particular debt to Dr. Marianne Mathys for her help on a variety of issues and to Valerie Nunn, who provided the English translation of this paper.

Studying ancient sculptures as collected works integrated into architectural structures with a particular function is one of the objectives of recent research in the field of ancient Greek and Roman sculpture. Achieving an understanding of the purposes for which statues were erected in Hellenistic gymnasia has been one of the most recent results of this research.¹ Like any other civic or sacred public space in ancient Greece, gymnasia were packed with works of sculpture, which had specific purposes, closely linked with the function of the gymnasium and its various educational and cultural objectives. In the following, I will refer especially to statues erected in gymnasia after the death of the depicted person, and more specifically to statues of youths who had still been training in the gymnasium when they died prematurely. In order to understand the context in which these statues were set up, I will start with some introductory remarks about the sort of sculptures that were erected in gymnasia in general.

1 Sculptural decoration of gymnasia

From Archaic times onwards, statues of Hermes and Herakles were erected in gymnasia as cult statues and dedications. Later other gods and heroes, who embodied the ideals of youth in their myths, were added. The adjectives *ἀγώνιος* or *ἐναγώνιος*, *δρόμιος*, *παλαιστρίτης*, *ἐπιτέρμιος*, *τύχων*, *ἐπινίκιος*, *λόγιος*,² reflect the cultural content that the worship of the gods acquired in the context of the educational role of gymnasia. In sculpture the above mentioned characteristics acquire visual

substance through the use of specific iconographic types and motifs. The beardless, naked representation of a youth with prominent depiction of the musculature and cauliflower ears is characteristic of the sculptural types of the Hermes/Herakles Enagonios, e.g. the Hermes of Kyrene,³ the Richelieu Hermes⁴ and the Lansdowne Herakles⁵ types, and is associated with the ideals of athleticism and physical combat.

However, it was chiefly herms that were used for religious purposes in gymnasia. Scenes depicted in Attic vase painting show cult practices involving herms, flanked by youths holding strigils, and by aryballoi as symbols of the palaestra, depicted in the background.⁶ Herms with a bearded or beardless Hermes and/or of Herakles were dedicated in gymnasia by gymnasiarchs at the end of their period of office and by the youths of the gymnasium. The latter set up herms as individuals or collectively, as a thank offering to the gods and as a reminder of some victory in the gymnic contests, on the celebration of the Hermaia (or other festivals) that were generally celebrated at the end of the gymnasium year.⁷

Moreover, from the third century BCE onwards, portrait statues of rulers⁸, leitourgoi and/or other officials of the gymnasium⁹ and other benefactors,¹⁰ who were honored in life or after death for their various acts of generosity to these institutions, were set up in the gymnasia. As a special honor, rulers or benefactors could be equated with Hermes or Herakles. Imagery on the coinage and in the minor arts depicting rulers with the symbols of Hermes or Herakles may represent their statues in divine form set up in gymnasia, which functioned

1 Sculptures from Hellenistic gymnasia and their uses was the subject of my Ph.D. thesis. The thesis was completed under the supervision of Prof. Theodosia Stephanidou-Tiveriou, was submitted to the Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki in 2011 and published in 2015; Kazakidi 2015. Earlier literature on the same subject includes Delorme 1960, 362–373; von Hesberg 1995; von den Hoff 2004; Martini 2004; Trombetti 2013, 163–169; Mathys 2016.
2 Roscher 1965, 2367–2369; Scherer 1912; Siska 1933, 26; Wrede 1986, 17.
3 Inan 1975, 19 no. 3 pl. X. 1–2; Kazakidi 2015, 74.
4 Maderna 1988, 82–84, with literature.
5 For the Lansdowne Herakles type see mainly Kansteiner 2000, 3–24. I assume that the prototype of the Lansdowne type depicted Herakles in his capacity as *enagonios*, regardless of where it was sited (on the debate over its location see Kazakidi 2015, 82–83). This is evident from the cauliflower ears, regarded as a feature of the prototype, as well as from the fact that the head of the Lansdowne type was extensively reproduced in the form of the herm; see Kazakidi 2015, 82–83. Despite the fact that we do not know whether any of the respective prototypes was intended to be set up in a gymnasium of the classical period, we assume that classical creations, which incarnated the young, athletic nature of Hermes and

Herakles, most probably inspired Hellenistic sculptors who worked on assignments for the gymnasia, regardless of where their prototypes had been erected. In reality though, the way that gods were represented in the Hellenistic gymnasia can be deduced with certainty only in a very few cases thanks to evidence from documentary sources or due to the survival of the works themselves, Kazakidi 2015, 76–79, 80–86; von den Hoff in this volume.

6 Zanker 1965, 91–103; Hollein 1988, 84; Rückert 1998, 127.

7 Kazakidi 2015, 119–125. For herms in Gymnasia and Stadia see Cic. *Att.* 1,6,2 l. 5–7; Michalowski 1930, 143–153; Delorme 1960, 339, 364; Harrison 1965, 124; Willers 1967, 44; Wrede 1986, 34–36; Rückert 1998, 126–132.

8 See recently Kazakidi 2015, 130–141 (with earlier literature).

9 For examples see Gauthier 1985, sporadically; Gauthier 2005 and recently Kazakidi 2015, 141–153, with earlier literature; see also Pantelis Nigdelis and Nikoleta Vouronikou: “Early Evidence of the Imperial Cult from the Gymnasium of Amphipolis.” *Nikephoros* (forthcoming). – Teachers (παιδευταί) are more seldom honoured, Chaniotis 2014, 273 n. 88.

10 Kazakidi 2015, 149–150.

as counterparts of the statues of the gods of the palaestra.¹¹ Yet rulers also flaunted their power and prestige in other ways, as is attested by the fragments of the group of colossal marble statues from the gymnasium in Pergamon, where the Attalid kings were depicted in armor.¹²

It is well known that, in the Late Hellenistic period, the gymnasium became one of the most important places for honoring – whether in life or after death – the benefactors of a city. These honorific statues were for the most part made of bronze. Their symbolism peaks when these statues are associated with religious practices, in other words in cases where the honorand was deified or heroized. These honorific statues were mainly commissioned by various groups of youths and others involved in the gymnasia or – more often from the late first century BCE onwards – by the city through its collective bodies.¹³

There is also evidence of statues of athletes who had brought glory to their home cities with enviable victories in the Panhellenic games and who were then turned into ideal models of youth and vigor through their statues.¹⁴

Among the statues of gods and mythical heroes, Panhellenic victors and officials, benefactors and rulers, statues of young men too were erected in gymnasia because of their premature deaths. Since there has hitherto been no special study of this kind of posthumous honorstatues, whose presence in the gymnasia is attested in the written sources, the aim of this paper is to specifically focus on these sculptures. The relevant textual references come from the Late Hellenistic period; and there are not many of them. Yet they are of interest not only because we can use them as comparanda in our attempts to understand the content and the function of certain statues found in the gymnasia, but also because they are beautiful examples of the perceptions and beliefs of the ancients with regard to youth and death. I shall refer to three of them by way of example.

2 Posthumous honors of youths – written evidence

The most complete text of this kind is the inscribed decree from Aegiale on Amorgos of the end of the second century BCE, well known in the literature, in respect of the heroization of Aleximachos, son of Kritolaos – undoubtedly a young man of the gymnasium. This decree gives details of the activities (sacrifice, a sacrificial meal and games) that would take place after his death over two days in the city's gymnasium and that were to be repeated every year. Aleximachos's statue would have been set up as part of the heroization process.¹⁵

Around the same time, at the end of the second century BCE in Chios, the demos voted to erect in the gymnasium statues of the sons of the Roman benefactor Lucius Nassius, who – we are told – died young.¹⁶

Over a century later, in the early Imperial period the ephebes of Sparta set up an image of one of their number, Damokrates, in each of the two palaestrae where they exercised. In the verses that have come down to us, Damokrates is described as being “like another Hermes” (or “like a young Hermes”) – thus we are most probably dealing with a posthumous image of an adolescent.¹⁷

The erection of the statues must have been part of posthumous honors awarded to these young men, as the Aegiale decree attests. The awarding of posthumous honors to young men, which involved the public performance of blood sacrifices and gymnastic contests, is also attested in relation to gymnasia, e.g. on Kos¹⁸ and on Amorgos.¹⁹

We do not know for sure in what circumstances it was decided to award public honors to a youth who had died before or immediately after finishing his time in the gymnasium. Unfortunately, we have no information on how the young men thus honored died; if, for example, they died heroically in battle. The sources refer

11 Lehmann 1988.

12 Von den Hoff 2004; Gans 2006, 101 cat. no. 37, pl. 15. 1; Laube 2006, 80; von den Hoff and Petersen 2011, 76 cat. no. 3 (E. Seitz); Kazakidi 2015, 133–135; von den Hoff, in this volume.

13 See mainly Gauthier 2005; Kazakidi 2015, 141–147.

14 Kazakidi 2015, 153–161; Mathys 2016. Another category of statues is that of the intellectual. Apart from the statues of philosophers in Athenian gymnasia, in association with which the famous philosophical schools operated, statues of poets and historiographers are attested in gymnasia in other cities, even if we have very little information on this, Kazakidi 2015, 172–186.

15 IG XII, 7, 515; Gauthier 1980, 210–220; Helms 2003; Vössing 2004, 561–

566; Chankowski 2010, 466 cat. no. 97; Kazakidi 2015, 285–286 cat. no. 46.E1.

16 I. Kios 15; Chiricat 2000, 31, cat. no. 8; Kazakidi 2015, 293 cat. no. 52.E2.

17 IG V, 1, 493, l. 3–7: “... Δαμοκράτη, νέ / ον Ἑρμείαν, υἱὸν / Διοκλῆος, ἀμφὶ / παλαίστραισιν στή / σαμεν ἡμετέρας...” Michalowski 1930, 145; Wrede 1981, 207; Maderna 1988, 109 n. 816; Kazakidi 2015, 229 cat. no. 18.E2.

18 Segre 1993, 86. Chankowski 2010, 453 cat. no. 38.

19 IG XII, 7, 447; Delorme 1960, 209; SEG XLVI, 1179; Sève 1996; Chankowski 2010, 466 cat. no. 97; Martzavou and Papazarkadas 2013, 190; Kazakidi 2015, 286 cat. no. 46.E3. For the interpretation of the Heroon of Calydon as a palaestra see recently Charatzopoulou 2006.

only to the virtue and discipline that characterized these teenagers in their lifetimes. Over and above their premature death, putting up the necessary money would have been a basic requirement for the creation of the statues dedicated to them, as would funding the funerary rituals, including the setting up of the statue.

The sponsors in the cases mentioned above were relatives or friends of the deceased. On Amorgos, Kritolaos gave 2000 drachmas to the demos, from the interest on which the costly celebrations of his son's heroization would be paid.²⁰ Probably something similar happened with the wealthy Roman Lucius Nassius and the statues of his prematurely deceased sons. For Damokrates of Sparta, his fellow ephebes paid.²¹

The ceremonies for awarding posthumous honors to youths in the gymnasium must have been associated with the long-established tradition of burying heroes, and periodically awarding them honors in the gymnasium. As is well known, from the late Hellenistic period onwards, not only benefactors but also their descendants were buried in gymnasia as a way of honoring them.²²

Like the honorific statues of benefactors, it seems that the statues of these young men were set up in rooms with some official function and in conspicuous places in the gymnasia: those of the sons of Nassius were in the *ἀκροατήριον*²³ of the Chios gymnasium, a spot that their father, the benefactor, would have chosen himself; Aleximachos' statue probably stood at the entrance to the triclinium of the Aegiale gymnasium, as can be inferred from the inscription. The statue had to be placed in an atrium, because of the altar in front of it, which was used for carrying out blood sacrifices.²⁴

When youths were honored with burials within the gymnasia, it is reasonable to assume that monumental tombs (*ἡρώα*²⁵) were erected. Tombs of this kind honoring local benefactors have been identified, for instance, in the gymnasia of Messene²⁶ and Nikopolis.²⁷

However, the erection of a statue of a youth within

the gymnasium is not necessarily an indication of his public burial there: for example, the burial of Aleximachos is not recorded in his decree. Moreover, statues of deceased youths had been erected by their relatives or friends in public places unrelated to the location of their tombs from as early as the fourth century BCE onwards, as the sources reveal.²⁸

The decree relating to Aleximachos also sheds light on a more specific function assumed by these statues in the gymnasium: during the annual ceremonies in honor of Aleximachos a ram was slaughtered and then set in front of the statue of the deceased. At the end of the gymnastic contests, with which the festivities were brought to an end, "Aleximachos" was crowned as the symbolic winner of the *pankration*. (100–103 ... ὅτι στεφανοῦσιν οἱ πρεσβυτέροι [καὶ] οἱ ἑφηβοὶ καὶ οἱ | [νέ]οι πάντες Ἀλεξίμαχο[ν] Κριτολάου ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα καὶ εὐταξίας ἧς | [ἐ]χ[ω]ν διετέλει): there is no doubt that the action of (annual) crowning refers in this case to the statue of Aleximachos.

3 Posthumous statues of youths – archaeological evidence

So how were these dead youths depicted in the gymnasia? As is well known, when it comes to honorific statuary, the character and deeds worthy of note of the honoree, which would be recorded in the lines of verse written on the pedestal of the statue and above all in the honorific decree inscribed close by, were indicative of the iconographic type that would be chosen to depict this person, who might be shown with further attributes or symbols.

In the decrees from Amorgos and Chios there is no hint of the iconography of the statues that were to be erected. The fact that the term *ἄγαλμα* (statue) was used in both decrees probably points to statues in marble.²⁹

20 IG XII, 7, 515 l. 8.

21 IG V, 1, 493 l. 1–10.

22 For honorary burials in polis and especially in gymnasia see Kader 1995; Ehrhardt 2008; and mainly Chiriac 2005.

23 On the interpretation of this room as an *auditorium* see Delorme 1960, 324; Nielsen 1990, 166; Hoepfner 2002, 67.

24 IG XII, 7, 515 l. 74–78: "...οἱ ἐπιμελῆ / [τ]αὶ τῇ νομηνίᾳ σφαῖρατῶσαν ἅμα τῇ ἡμέρᾳ κριὸν ὡς βέλτιστον πρὸς / [τ]ῷ ἀγάλματι ὡς ἂν στήσῃ Κριτόλαος τοῦ υἱοῦ Ἀλεξίμαχοῦ καὶ πα[ρ]α / [θ]έτωσαν παράθεσιν ἐκ πυρῶν ἡμέκτων τεσσάρων καὶ τοῦ κριοῦ τὰ κρέα / ὅλο]μελῇ ἀποζέσα-

ντες παρατιθέτωσαν τῷ ἀγάλματι καὶ τὴν παράθεσιν." – For the use of triclinia in this context, which could be either built or outdoor places, see Braune 2008, 19–23. For the term see also Vössing 2004, 561–566, especially 564 n. 1.

25 For the term see recently Stéphanidou-Tiveriou 2009, 345–387.

26 Themeles 2000, 114–136; Ito 2002; Flämig 2007, 175–176 cat. no. 76.

27 Zachos 1994; Flämig 2007, 150 cat. no. 28.

28 Diog. Laert. 5.51. See Voutiras 2001, 141 n. 77, 142.

29 Tuchelt 1979, 86. For the term see recently also Kazakidi 2015, 166 n. 1163.

Though we do not know what the images of the heroized Aleximachos and the sons of Lucius looked like, we may be able to identify similar content in some other marble statues found in other gymnasia.

A statue of Kleoneikos, son of Lysander, was erected in the gymnasium in Eretria in the late first century BCE by his friend Amphikrates, son of (most probably another) Lysander (Fig. 1).³⁰ The statue and its base were found at the end of the 19th century at the northern side of the western palaestra, which was most likely the most important place of the gymnasium.³¹ The inscription says nothing about the identity of the honorand. However, according to Stefan Lehmann's interpretation of the relief scene on the base, it was a youth who trained in the palaestra, shown with his training gloves.³² Klaus Fittschen had previously proposed another interpretation of the work based on the use of marble and its iconography: he suggested that it was a young man who had fallen on the battlefield.³³ But this has been challenged recently by Elena Mango, who argues that, since the work was set up in an urban context, it could not have been a funerary monument. She interpreted it as a live "gebildeter Palaistrit", who had been honored by a friend for some victory in athletics or more generally for his exceptional achievements in the gymnasium.³⁴ Nevertheless, erecting a statue to a live *palaistrites* in a gymnasium in honor of his achievements has no parallels in the written sources. According to written sources, statues of athletes were erected in gymnasia in the Hellenistic period only for winners in Panhellenic Games.³⁵ Yet Kleoneikos was certainly not a Panhellenic champion, because in this case, his victory would have been commemorated in the inscription on the plinth and the iconography of the work would most likely have been different. However, he cannot have been an official or a

benefactor either, as in such cases the individual's rank is usually mentioned in the votive inscription that accompanies the work.³⁶ Moreover, the type of gloves depicted on the statue's plinth, which were, according to Lehmann's research, used only in training, points to a young man. The idea that someone had set up this marble statue in a private capacity might be easier to explain in the context of the tradition of awarding posthumous honors in gymnasia, as described above based on the evidence of the roughly contemporary decrees relating to the sons of Nassius on Chios and young Aleximachos on Amorgos.

Moreover, it should be noted here that the head of Kleoneikos presents an interesting technical detail, which has not been mentioned in the literature. The statue must have been crowned at regular intervals with a wreath. This is attested by an inconspicuous indentation on the back of the head, at the nape of the neck that extends to just behind the ear (Fig. 2).³⁷ There is evidence of wreaths being put on statues of the living, at least in exceptional cases. However, there are perhaps some discreet iconographical hints that this is a statue of someone who has died, possibly someone who has been elevated to the status of a hero; these hints include, as already recognized by Klaus Fittschen, the naked feet and the idealized face,³⁸ but also the hairstyle modelled on that of the Richelieu Hermes. Consequently, maybe we can posit that Kleoneikos was celebrated in rituals like those attested for the heroization of Aleximachos.

If the statue of Kleoneikos was indeed used like the statue of Aleximachos, in front of which sacrifices took place,³⁹ then we can also assume that the former was originally placed in the north stoa or rather in front of it.⁴⁰ Since the overall height of the statue including its

30 Athens, National Archaeological Museum inv. nos. 244, D306, 1924; IG XII, 9, 281; Fittschen 1995, 98–108; SEG XLV, 1219; Mango 2001; Lehmann 2001; Mango 2003, 159 cat. no. S6; Kazakidi 2015, 251–252 cat. no. 30.E6/T4 with n. 1477 for a date at the end of the first century BCE.

31 Mango 2001, 280 fig. 40.3; Mango 2003, 159 cat. no. S6 who argue that the statue was set up in room F; Ackermann – Reber, in this volume. For the north side as the most prominent place of the gymnasium, see Kazakidi 2015, 197–198.

32 Lehmann 2001.

33 Fittschen 1995.

34 Mango 2001.

35 Kazakidi 2015, 153–161; Mathys 2016.

36 Gauthier 2005; Kazakidi 2015, 141–147.

37 Detailed argumentation in Kazakidi 2015, 171 pl. 14. Many late Hellenistic heads present analogous technical details; for examples see recently

Mathys 2016, fig. 4; Kazakidi 2018, 294 fig. 2, 295. The provision that some statues should be crowned at regular intervals is attested in honorary degrees already since the fourth century BCE, see for example IG XII, 4 1, 348 l. 20–23; cf. Günther 2003. The crowning of statues is also the subject of a Ph.D. thesis by Elena Gomez under the supervision of Prof. Ralf von den Hoff.

38 Fittschen 1995, 98.

39 IG XII, 7, 515 l. 74–78.

40 A possible location could be one of the plinths that were found in front of rooms E and F; cf. the plan of Ackermann and Reber in this volume, fig. 1. In gymnasia, most dedications should have been set up in the peristyle of the palaestra; see ID 1417, AI, l. 118–154. Especially honorary statues were presented *ἐν τῷ ἐπιφανεστάτῳ τόπῳ* of gymnasia, notably in the north side of the palaestra; for examples see Kazakidi 2015, 189–190.



Fig. 1 Statue of Kleoneikos, from the gymnasium of Eretria; Athens, National Archaeological Museum inv. no. 244.

base is about 3 m, a ladder, either portable or fixed, must have been used for the crowning. As comparison, one may cite the built ensemble of statue base, altar, and staircase that was found in situ in the Samnite palaestra of Pompeii and must have served for some kind of honorific or even cultic ceremony.⁴¹

The idealized head of Kleoneikos' statue is combined with the civic-style himation. As is well known, this form of dress and the way it is worn creates a picture that reflects the prevailing view of what constituted the appropriate appearance of ephebes being educated in the gymnasium at the time.⁴²

Other marble himatiophoroi were also set up in gymnasia to honor the dead, of course not only young men, but also, and probably even mainly, benefactors of the gymnasium. The age of those depicted is often not easy to ascertain when epigraphic evidence is lacking. The finds from the mid-first-century CE gymnasium in Messene are revealing. In the empty space behind the stoa of the gymnasium monumental tombs were built in the late Hellenistic and early Imperial period, while chambers were created on the back wall of the stoa for funerary cult purposes, where statues of mortals posthumously elevated to the status of heroes were erected. In one of these chambers, soon after the middle of the first century CE, a heroized benefactor is depicted, like Kleoneikos, in the form of a himatiophoros (Fig. 3).⁴³ Yet naked idealized types of statuary could easily be understood as embodying the heroized state of the deceased.⁴⁴ From the room in which the himatiophoros of Messene was found comes another statue of a naked youth,⁴⁵ which can also be dated to shortly after the mid-first century CE (Fig. 4).⁴⁶

The individualized features and find spot of this statue suggest that we are dealing with a depiction of a deceased mortal in the form of a god. In the adjoining chamber the heroized Dionysios Aristomenos was depicted in a similar type, as is suggested by the evidence



Fig. 2 Statue of Kleoneikos, detail of the back of the head; Athens, National Archaeological Museum inv. no. 244.

of an inscribed pedestal and few sculptural fragments.⁴⁷

It is well known that contemporary research is inclined to see posthumous portrait statues, i.e. heroized depictions of mortals, generally young ones, in statues of the late Hellenistic period that preserve more or less faithfully certain types of Hermes, even when they have survived without their heads. On the basis of this generalized premise, the suggestion has been made that the mid-first-century BCE headless statue from the gymnasium of Melos in the type of the Richelieu Hermes was also a depiction of some dead ephebe in divine form.⁴⁸

There are other Late Hellenistic marble torsos and heads from gymnasia that imitate idealized models and probably depicted posthumous portraits, as their iconography suggests. These include a head from the gymnasium in Kos⁴⁹ or another showing signs of annual crowning with a wreath from Pergamon,⁵⁰ as well as the youth shown putting a wreath on his own head

41 Avagliano – Montalbano in this volume; Henzel in this volume; Trümper in this volume. See also the staircase of the base from the Heroon of Palatiano, Stéphanidou-Tiveriou 2009, 378 fig. 2; 385 pl. 4-6.

42 Zanker 1995, 221; Hallett 1998, 82 n. 54.

43 Messene, Archaeological Museum inv. no. 8650: Themeles 2001, 13, pls. 3, 4; Kazakidi 2015, 239–240 cat. no. 21.Γ6.

44 For the heroic nudity see mainly Hallett 2005; also Maderna 1988, 74–78, 112–116.

45 Messene, Archaeological Museum inv. no. 8664: Themeles 2001, 14 pl. 5; Palagia 2000, 434–436 fig. 5; Kazakidi 2015, 238–239 cat. no. 21.Γ4.

46 For the date and the statue type see Kazakidi 2015, 238–239 cat. no.

21.Γ4.

47 Themeles 2001, 15 fig. 5, 4; Kazakidi 2015, 235 cat. no. 21.E7; 240–241 cat. no. 21.Γ9.

48 Maderna 1988, 225; Kazakidi 2015, 287 cat. no. 47.Γ2.

49 Paris, Louvre inv. no. Ma 850: Kabus-Preissshofen 1989, 164, 286–287 cat. no. 83 (with further literature), pl. 73, 1–2; Hamiaux 1998, 63 cat. no. 68; Kazakidi 2015, 298 cat. no. 57.Γ1.

50 Berlin, Antikensammlung SMB inv. no. P 136: von den Hoff 2004, 385 fig. 7; Gans 2006, 101–102; Kazakidi 2015, 310–311 cat. no. 60.Γ5; Mathys 2016, 138–140 (with further literature), figs. 3–4.



Fig. 3 Statue of a himatophoros, from the gymnasium in Messene; Messene, Archaeological Museum inv. no. 8650.



Fig. 4 Statue of a naked youth, from the gymnasium in Messene; Messene, Archaeological Museum inv. no. 8664.

that comes from the same gymnasium.⁵¹ The sculptures mentioned above have been identified as athletes by certain scholars – independently of one another – on the basic grounds that they had been found in gymnasia.⁵² Yet we should make a distinction, in terms of their respective roles, between statues set up in order to honor an athlete for a glorious victory in the games and those that were set up on the occasion of the death of some honored person. However, when there is no inscription, this distinction is not easily made based on iconography alone. Nevertheless, we might venture to distinguish between certain works as regards their content simply because of their iconography. The powerful marble head of the boxer from the gymnasium at Olympia of roughly the mid-third century BCE⁵³ is perhaps a good example of how we might imagine a dedication to a victorious professional athlete.⁵⁴ By contrast, the sybaritic ephebe from the gymnasium in Kos, with his downcast gaze, probably depicted a dead youth.⁵⁵

While the late Hellenistic decrees for Aleximachos and the sons of Nassius refer to statues – i.e. they were sculptures in the round⁵⁶ – the late first-century/early second-century CE verses for Damokrates were found carved on the torso of a now lost headless herm.⁵⁷ We can only imagine a beardless head for the young Damokrates. Thus, this monument is evidence of a herm being connected with a portrait head of a beardless youth.

There is another mid-first century CE monument that may depict a dead youth in the form of a herm, notably on the relief of Doras from Perinthos, an unfortunate young *palaistrites* (Fig. 5).⁵⁸ A herm with a beardless head in the center of the scene is surrounded by the triumphal symbols of the palaestra and verses in which Doras introduces himself in the first person. Several facts suggest that this herm does not depict Hermes or Herakles but embodies the deceased himself: the prominent

place the herm occupies in the composition; the content of the verses surrounding it, in which the deceased is compared with Herakles (l. 2: “... ἄξιον Ἡρακλέους”, i.e. worthy of Herakles), and described as a hero himself (l. 13–14: “... ἡρώων οὐδενὶ λειπόμενος”, i.e. who lacks nothing of the hero or who is in no way inferior to the heroes); and the fact that the figure of the dead youth is otherwise absent from the scene. In this case, the verses, written in the first person, are spoken by the herm itself, which depicts Doras, in other words the deceased, as a hero. The relief plaque must have been part of the revetment of a built monument, perhaps a heroon in a gymnasium.⁵⁹

Though they have been published for many years, the two above mentioned monuments have not hitherto been used in the debate over the interpretation of herms with beardless, youthful heads. Some of these heads, dating from the mid-second century BCE onwards, display individualized features and cauliflower ears. Generally speaking, they have survived without their inscribed pedestals. Consequently, this has presented scholars with a dilemma: are they busts of mortals – as, for example, Kazimierz Michalowski, Jean Marcadé and others have maintained⁶⁰ – or of Hermes adopting the features of his worshippers, as Henning Wrede finally deduced in his study on herms, taking into account the corresponding suggestion by Paul Zanker about the depictions of herms in fifth-century BCE vase painting.⁶¹

Examples of Hellenistic herms depicting young, beardless heads and preserving their inscriptions substantiate the identification with Hermes, e.g. the well-known relief depiction of the himatiophoros herm of Hermes Tychon,⁶² as well as an intact mid-second-century BCE herm from the gymnasium of Tinos with a swollen right ear (i.e. the so-called ‘cauliflower’ ear of a pugilist), only recently documented in literature.⁶³ But

51 Izmir, Archaeological Museum inv. no. 571: von den Hoff 2004, 385 n. 87 fig. 6; Gans 2006, 104 cat. no. 39; Kazakidi 2015, 311 cat. no. 60.Γ6; Mathys 2016, 140 fig. 5.

52 Hübner 1986, 13; Gans 2006, 105; cf. Heilmeyer 1997, 74.

53 Geominy 2007, 71 fig. 92 a–c (with earlier literature); Kazakidi 2015, 226–227 cat. no. 13.Γ1.

54 On the function of this statue as a dedication of a victorious athlete, see Kazakidi 2015, 159.

55 Berlin, Antikensammlung SMB inv. no. P 136: von den Hoff 2004, 385 fig. 7; Gans 2006, 101–102; Kazakidi 2015, 310–311 cat. no. 60.Γ5; Mathys 2016, 138–140 (with further literature), figs. 3, 4.4.

56 IG XII, 7, 515 l. 78; I. Kos 15, l. 12–13.

57 IG V, 1, 493, l. 3–7.

58 Thessaloniki, Archaeological Museum inv. no. 944: Adam-Velene, Tsankarake, and Chatzenikolaou 2016, cat. no. 19 (N. Kazakidi); Kazakidi 2017.

59 See Kazakidi 2017, 284–285, for further argumentation.

60 Michalowski 1932, 35; Marcadé 1953, 311; Marcadé 1969, 274; Pfuhl and Möbius 1977, 46.

61 Zanker 1965, 95, 99; Pfuhl and Möbius 1977, 46; Wrede 1986, 71–72; Harrison 1965, 125.

62 Berlin, Antikensammlung SMB inv. no. Sk 1936: Wrede 1986, 17; Megow 1997.

63 See Kazakidi 2015, 282 cat. no. 40.E1/Γ1.



Fig. 5 Relief of Doras from Perinthos, Thessaloniki, Archaeological Museum inv. no. 944.

when and in what circumstances was the herm first combined with a youthful, beardless portrait head, as happened around the middle of the first century CE in the depictions of Damokrates and Doras?

As is well known, herms bearing portrait busts, for the most part historic depictions of important intellectuals, are known from the mid-first century BCE.⁶⁴ As Klaus Fittschen noted recently, mass production of these works must have begun in Athens in the neo-Attic workshops and the aim was, above all, to supply the Italian market with sculptures for private villas.⁶⁵

But when it comes to the herms of the heroized youths of the gymnasium we shall have to turn, for lack of earlier inscriptions, to the iconography of the works themselves. In the Hellenistic period, beardless heads on herms were generally works created using a certain amount of artistic license, adopting the basic iconography of the athlete, developed as early as the Classical period, while at the same time following contemporary trends in individual portrait busts. The late fourth-/early third-century BCE examples are characterized by idealization and a lack of individual features.⁶⁶ However, it was not long before individualized features began to

prevail, giving each head its own character; this is obvious from the heads of the second century BCE, such as those from the gymnasium of Melos.⁶⁷ Even more forceful depiction of physiognomy is found in late Hellenistic heads, such as those from the gymnasium of Delos (Fig. 6)⁶⁸ and Amphipolis (Fig. 7).⁶⁹

Perhaps, with the albeit later examples of Damokrates and Doras in mind, which are backed up by inscriptions, we might wonder whether some of these late Hellenistic works may indeed depict specific *palaistrites* – just as Casimir Michalowski once asked himself regarding the herms from the gymnasium of Delos,⁷⁰ or as we might suggest for those from the gymnasia of Melos⁷¹ and of Amphipolis.⁷² Moreover, the contemporary use of statuary types of Hermes in the posthumous depictions of young men, which can be observed, according to Caterina Maderna, from as early as the mid-first century BCE onwards, represents a similar phenomenon.⁷³

Thus, as stated above, even if linking the herm with a youthful portrait bust is only attested epigraphically from around the middle of the first century CE onwards, heads with individualized features can perhaps point to

⁶⁴ Raubitschek 1949; Harrison 1965, 127; Richter 1965, 116 no. 10.

⁶⁵ Fittschen 2008, 330.

⁶⁶ Athens, National Archaeological Museum inv. no. 1629: Kazakidi 2015, 111 n. 725, pl. 5.1–4; Athens, National Archaeological Museum inv. nos. 313 and 317: Petrakos 1999, 283–284 figs. 193 and 198a; Rhamnous, Archaeological Museum inv. no. 2257: Petrakos 1999, 197. 198b; Eretria, Archaeological Museum inv. no. 341: Gard 1974, 50–51, pl. 11. 1–4; Volos, Archaeological Museum inv. nos. BE 8684 and A 533: Kazakidi 2015, 111 n. 724.

⁶⁷ Paris, Louvre Museum inv. nos MA 404 and 403: Hamiaux 1998, 48–49 nos. 58–59; Kazakidi 2015, 288–289 cat. nos. 47.Γ4, pl. 11. 1–2 and 47.Γ5, pls. 10. 3 and 11. 3–4.

⁶⁸ Delos, Archaeological Museum inv. no. A 5923: Marcadé 1969, pl. XVI; Kazakidi 2015, 275–276 cat. no. 39.Γ1, pl. 6. 1–3; Inv. no. A 5925: Michalowski 1930, 135 pl. IV; Kazakidi 2015, 276 cat. no. 39.Γ2, pl. 6. 4–6; Inv. no. 7395: Michalowski 1930, 135 pl. V; Kazakidi 2015, 276–277

cat. no. 39.Γ3, pls. 8. 1 and 9. 1–2; Inv. no. A 3862: Michalowski 1932, 55 pl. 39; Kazakidi 2015, 277 cat. no. 39.Γ4, pls. 8. 4 and 10. 4; Inv. no. A 7394: Michalowski 1930, 138 pl. VI; Kazakidi 2015, 277 cat. no. 39.Γ5, pls. 8. 3 and 10. 1–2; Inv. no. A 7397: Michalowski 1930, 139 pl. VII; Kazakidi 2015, 278 cat. no. 39.Γ6, pls. 8. 2 and 9. 3–4; Inv. no. A 5637: Marcadé 1953, 512, figs. 15, 17; Marcadé 1969, pl. XV.

⁶⁹ Amphipolis, Archaeological Museum inv. nos. A 117 and A 548: Kazakidi 2015, 262–263 cat. nos. 37.Γ2 and 37.Γ4.

⁷⁰ Michalowski 1932, 35.

⁷¹ Paris, Louvre Museum inv. nos MA 404 and 403: Hamiaux 1998, 48–49 nos. 58–59; Kazakidi 2015, nos. 47.Γ4, pl. 11. 1–2 and 47.Γ5, pls. 10. 3 and 11. 3–4.

⁷² Amphipolis, Archaeological Museum inv. nos. A 117 and A 548: Kazakidi 2015, 262–263 cat. nos. 37.Γ2 and 37.Γ4.

⁷³ Maderna 1988, 104, 112–116.




Fig. 6 Head from the gymnasium of Delos; Delos, Archaeological Museum inv. no. A 7397.



Fig. 7 Head from the gymnasium of Amphipolis, Archaeological Museum inv. no. A 548.

a somewhat earlier date for the concept of this kind of depiction of a youth in divine form in the type *par excellence* of Hermes ἐνγώνιος, the *herm*. In this case, in the context of posthumous rituals, these particular herms would probably have had a similar purpose to that of the honorific posthumous statues of young men known to us from inscriptions, such as the decree relating to Aleximachos. In other words, they were posthumous portraits that preserved, thanks to their iconography, the divine influence of the presence of the god Hermes. Even though, in fact, some individual features are recognizable in these portraits, as noted above, nevertheless the main objective in making them must not have been to depict the realistic physiognomy of the youth concerned. Moreover, we must take into account the conditions in which these works were created: i.e.

they would have been made after the deceased had been buried. Thus, they were more likely images of the heroized state of the subject, whose human dimension had ceased to exist. And indeed on the basis of everything that has been demonstrated above, I think it is reasonable to suggest that the link between the *herm* and the youthful portrait bust emerged in the context of the tradition of awarding posthumous honors to ephebes associated with the gymnasium.

4 Conclusion

Thus, in creating posthumous depictions in the gymnasium, a practice that is well attested thanks to the corresponding decrees from the end of the second century

BCE, it was the type of the *himatiophoros*, various types of the god *Hermes* in the round and the *herm* that were used. We cannot be certain as to when the godlike types were first employed, perhaps at some point well into the first century BCE. Similarly, we are not in a position to know what criteria were employed to select the iconographic type used to depict the deceased on any given occasion.

The death of a young man, and in particular before he had managed to complete his *ephebate* or soon after completion thereof, was handled with sensitivity by the society of the time, as a host of moving Hellenistic epigrams reveal.⁷⁴ And as emerges from the decree for *Aleximachos*, setting up statues of prematurely deceased young men in the gymnasium became part of the periodically celebrated public cult of the dead in accordance with contemporary attitudes to the hereafter. In this context, the posthumous statues ensured, above all, that the memory of the deceased was preserved. Moreover, in addition to the honorific reference to the person depicted, they also served another specific purpose: they suggested the presence of the youth himself at the funerary sacrifices and during the funeral banquet. Indeed, with its crowning, the statue took on a leading role as the symbolic winner of the gymnastic contests. The deceased was

raised to the sphere of the heroes through the veil of ceremonial practices and public awarding of honors that endowed the statue with a heroic aura. These heroic honors earned by the deceased would have been eternally echoed in the verses on the statue's pedestal, and perhaps by a decree set up next to the statue, but also by the statue itself through his depiction in divine form.

The statues of the sons of *Nassios*, of *Aleximachos*, *Damokrates*, and *Kleoneikos* functioned primarily as forceful expressions of the perception of the immortality of youth, which even the advent of death could not extinguish. The repeated ritual celebrations in which the statues played the lead role ensured that the deaths of these young men continued to be remembered. These statues were erected not in the cemetery, a place cut off from everyday life, but in the gymnasium, the beating heart of young men's everyday lives, and they were put not only among their former companions, but in the company of the statues of gods and benefactors. Thus, the statuary forms acquired life and a heroic air, and served as a consolation and even exoneration for a society that was unable to protect its young members. On a collective level, these works also functioned as symbols of the immortality of youth; a response to the awe inspired by death.

⁷⁴ For examples see Peek 1955, 104, 305, 615, 2081; IG XII, 6, 740; IG XII, 6, 1253; IG XII, 7, 115; IG XII, 7, 447; SEG 49, 361; CIG 2240; Vêrilhac 1982.

Bibliography

Adam-Velene, Tsankarake, and Chatzenikolaou 2016

Polyxene Adam-Velene, Euangelia Tsankarake, and Kalliopē G Chatzenikolaou, eds. *Παιδεστός – Θεσσαλονίκη. Αρχαιότητες σ' ένα ταξίδι προσφυγιάς*. Thessaloniki: Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki, 2016.

Braune 2008

Sarah Braune. *Convivium funebre. Gestaltung und Funktion römischer Grabtriklinien als Räume für sepulkrale Bankettfeiern*. Spudasmata 121. Zürich: Olms, 2008.

Chaniotis 2014

Angelos Chaniotis. “Η ζωή των ἀγαλιμάτων”. *Proceedings of the Academy of Athens* 89 (2014), 246–297.

Chankowski 2010

Andrzej S. Chankowski. *L'éphébie hellénistique: étude d'une institution civique dans les cités grecques des îles de la Mer Égée et de l'Asie Mineure*. Culture et cité 4. Paris: De Boccard, 2010.

Charatzopoulou 2006

Catherine Charatzopoulou. “L' héroon de Kalydon revisité”. In *Rois, cités, nécropoles: institutions, rites et monuments en Macédoine, actes des colloques de Nanterre, décembre 2002 et d'Athènes, janvier 2004*. Ed. by A.-M. Guimier-Sorbets, M. B. Hatzopoulos, and Y. Morizot. *Μελετήματα* 45. Athens and Paris: Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity, 2006, 63–87.

Chiricat 2000

Édouard Chiricat. *Les Cultes du Gymnase dans les cités hellénistiques d'Asie Mineure et des îles de l'Égée*. PhD thesis. Université de Lille, 2000.

Chiricat 2005

Édouard Chiricat. “Funérailles publiques et enterrement au gymnase à l'époque hellénistique”. In *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique*. Ed. by P. Fröhlich and C. Müller. *Hautes études du monde gréco-romain* 35. Geneva and Paris: Droz, 2005, 207–223.

Delorme 1960

Jean Delorme. *Gymnasion. Étude sur les monuments consacrés à l'éducation en Grèce (des origines à l'Empire romain)*. Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 1960. Paris: De Boccard, 1960.

Ehrhardt 2008

Norbert Ehrhardt. “Der Bürger als Heros: Staatsbegräbnis und Öffentlichkeit in Kyzikos”. In *Vom Euphrat bis zum Bosporus. Festschrift für Elmar Schwertheim zum 65. Geburtstag*. Ed. by W. Engelbert. *Asia Minor Studien* 65.1. Bonn: Habelt, 2008, 187–196.

Fittschen 1995

Klaus Fittschen. “Zur Bildnisstatue des Kleonikos, des Jünglings von Eretria”. *Eirene* (1995), 98–108.

Fittschen 2008

Klaus Fittschen. “Über den Beitrag der Bildhauer in Athen zur Kunstproduktion im Römischen Reich”. In *Η Αθήνα κατά τη Ρωμαϊκή εποχή: πρόσφατες ανακαλύψεις, νέες έρευνες*. Ed. by S. Vlizos. Athens: Persee, 2008, 325–336.

Flämig 2007

Catharina Flämig. *Grabarchitektur der römischen Kaiserzeit in Griechenland*. Rahden/Westf.: Marie Leidorf, 2007.

Gans 2006

Ulrich-Walter Gans. *Attalidische Herrscherbildnisse. Studien zur hellenistischen Porträtplastik Pergamons*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006.

Gard 1974

Jean-Michel Gard. “L'Hermès juvénile du Palais II d'Erétrie”. *Antike Kunst* 17 (1974), 50–59.

Gauthier 1980

Phillippe Gauthier. “Études sur des inscriptions d'Amorgos”. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 104 (1980), 197–220.

Gauthier 1985

Phillippe Gauthier. *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs (VIe–Ier siècle avant J.-C.). Contribution à l'histoire des institutions*. Bulletin de correspondance hellénique Supplement 12. Paris: De Boccard, 1985.

Gauthier 2005

Phillippe Gauthier. “Un gymnasarque honoré à Colophon”. *Chiron* 35 (2005), 101–111.

Geominy 2007

Wilfred A. Geominy. “The Daochos Monument at Delphi: The Style and Setting of a Family Portrait in Historic Dress”. In *Early Hellenistic Portraiture. Image, Style, Context*. Ed. by P. S. Schultz and R. von den Hoff. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007, 84–98.

Günther 2003

Wolfgang Günther. “Unsterbliche Kränze: Zur Selbstdarstellung milesischer Propheten in didymeischen Inschriften-denkmälern”. *Chiron* 33 (2003), 447–457.

Hallett 1998

Christopher H. Hallett. “A Group of Portrait Statues from the Civic Center of Aphrodisias”. *American Journal of Archaeology* 102 (1998), 59–89.

Hallett 2005

Christopher H. Hallett. *The Roman Nude: Heroic Portrait Statuary 200 BC–AD 300*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Hamiaux 1998

Marianne Hamiaux. *Musée du Louvre. Département des antiquités grecques, étrusques et romaines. Les sculptures grecques II. La période hellénistique (IIIe–Ier siècles avant J.-C.)*. Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux, 1998.

Harrison 1965

Evelyn B. Harrison. *Archaic and Archaistic Sculpture*. The Athenian Agora XI. Princeton and New Jersey: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1965.

Heilmeyer 1997

Wolf-Dieter Heilmeyer. *Der Pergamonaltar. Die neue Präsentation nach Restaurierung des Telephosfrieses*. Tübingen and Berlin: Wasmuth, 1997.

Helmis 2003

Andreas Helmis. "Entre les vivants et les morts. La fondation à la mémoire d'Aleximachos fils de Critolaos (IG XII 7, 515, IIe siècle av. J.C.)." In *Symposion 1999. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte*. Ed. by G. Thür and F. J. Fernández Nieto. Cologne: Böhlau, 2003, 463–480.

von Hesberg 1995

Henner von Hesberg. "Das griechische Gymnasion im 2. Jh. v. Chr." In *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus. Kolloquium München 24. bis 26. Juni 1993*. Ed. by M. Wörle and P. Zanker. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995, 13–28.

Hoepfner 2002

Wolfram Hoepfner. "Pergamon, Rhodos, Nysa, Athen. Bibliotheken in Gymnasien und anderen Lehr- und Forschungsstätten." In *Antike Bibliotheken*. Ed. by W. Hoepfner. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2002, 67–80.

von den Hoff 2004

Ralf von den Hoff. "Ornamenta gymnasiodon? Delos und Pergamon als Beispielfälle der Skulpturenausstattung hellenistischer Gymnasien." In *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 373–405.

von den Hoff and Petersen 2011

Ralf von den Hoff and Lars Petersen, eds. *Skulpturen in Pergamon. Gymnasium, Heiligtum, Palast*. Bönen: Druck Verlag Kettler, 2011.

Hollein 1988

Heinz-Günter Hollein. *Bürgerbild und Bildwelt der attischen Demokratie auf den rotfigurigen Vasen des 6.–4. Jhr. v. Chr.* Frankfurt a./M.: Peter Lang, 1988.

Hübner 1986

Gerhild Hübner. "Der Porträtkopf. Überlegungen zu pergamenischer Porträtplastik vom 2. Jh. v. Chr. bis in augusteische Zeit." In *Die Stadtgrabung. Teil 1, Das Heroon*. Ed. by N. Filgis and W. Radt. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986, 127–145.

Inan 1975

Jale Inan. *Roman Sculpture in Side*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1975.

Ito 2002

Juko Ito. *Architectural Studies of the three Grave Monuments in the Gymnasium Complex at Ancient Messene*. Kumamoto: Architectural Mission to Greece, 2002.

Kabus-Preishshofen 1989

Renate Kabus-Preishshofen. *Die hellenistische Plastik der Insel Kos*. Athenische Mittelungen 14 Beiheft. Berlin: Mann, 1989.

Kader 1995

Ingeborg Kader. "Heroa und Memorialbauten." In *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus. Kolloquium München, 24. bis 26. Juni 1993*. Ed. by M. Wörle and P. Zanker. Vestigia 47. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995, 199–229.

Kansteiner 2000

Sascha Kansteiner. *Herakles. Die Darstellungen in der Großplastik der Antik*. Cologne: Böhlau, 2000.

Kazakidi 2015

Natalia Kazakidi. *Εικόνες εν γυμνασίω. Έργα γλυπτικής στο ελληνιστικό γυμνάσιο: Ηπειρωτική Ελλάδα και νησιά του Αιγαίου*. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 2015.

Kazakidi 2017

Natalia Kazakidi. "Το ταφικό μνημείο του Δορά από την Πέρηνθο. παῖς γυμνασίων...ήρώων οὐδενὶ λειπόμενος." In *BONAE GRATIAE. Μελέτες ρωμαϊκής γλυπτικής προς τιμήν της καθηγήτριας Θεοδοσίας Στεφανίδου-Τιβερίου*. Ed. by E. Voutiras, E. Papagianni, and N. Kazakidi. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 2017, 281–289.

Kazakidi 2018

Natalia Kazakidi. "Ένα υποτιθέμενο πορτρέτο του Κλαυδίου στο Εθνικό Αρχαιολογικό Μουσείο Αθηνών και τα ελληνιστικά του παράλληλα από τη Σμύρνη." In *Γλυπτική και κοινωνία στη ρωμαϊκή Ελλάδα, Καλλιτεχνικά προϊόντα – κοινωνικές προβολές, Διεθνές Συνέδριο, Ρέθυμνο 2014 (2018)*. Ed. by P. Karanastasi, Th. Stephanidou-Tiveriou, and D. Damaskos. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 2018, 293–306.

Laube 2006

Ingrid Laube. *Thorakophoroi: Gestalt und Semantik des Brustpanzers in der Darstellung des 4. bis 1. Jhs. v. Chr.* Rahden/Westf.: Marie Leidorf, 2006.

Lehmann 1988

Stephan Lehmann. "Ptolemaios III. Euergetes. Hermes Enagorios als Pentathlos und Pankratiast." In *Griechische und römische Statuetten und Grossbronzen. Akten der 9. Internationalen Tagung über antike Bronzen*. Wien, 21.–25. April 1986. Ed. by K. Gschwantler and A. Bernhard-Walcher. Vienna: Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien, 1988, 290–301.

Lehmann 2001

Stephan Lehmann. "Der bekleidete Gymnasiast. Eine neue Deutung zum Jüngling von Eretria." *Antike Kunst* 44 (2001), 18–22.

Maderna 1988

Caterina Maderna. *Juppiter, Diomedes und Merkur als Vorbilder für römische Bildnisstatuen: Untersuchungen zum römischen statuarischen Idealporträt*. Heidelberg: Archäologie und Geschichte, 1988.

Mango 2001

Elena Mango. "Kleoneikos, ein gebildeter Palaistrer. Überlegungen zum Jüngling von Eretria." In *Zona Archeologica. Festschrift für Hans Peter Isler zum 60. Geburtstag*. Ed. by S. Buzzi. Bonn: Habelt, 2001, 279–288.

- Mango 2003**
Elena Mango. *Das Gymnasion*. Eretria XIII. Gollion: École suisse d'archéologie en Grèce, 2003.
- Marcadé 1953**
Jean Marcadé. "Les trouvailles de la maison dite de l'Hermès, à Délos". *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 77 (1953), 497–615.
- Marcadé 1969**
Jean Marcadé. *Au Musée de Délos. Étude sur la sculpture hellénistique en ronde bosse découverte dans l'île*. Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome – Série Athènes 215. Paris: De Boccard, 1969.
- Martini 2004**
Wolfram Martini. "Bemerkungen zur Statuenausstattung der hellenistischen Gymnasien". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 408–411.
- Martzavou and Papazarkadas 2013**
Paraskevi Martzavou and Nikolaos Papazarkadas, eds. *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-Classical Polis: Fourth Century B.C. to Second Century A.D.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Mathys 2016**
Marianne Mathys. "Athleten im Gymnasion von Pergamon". In *Athletics in the Hellenistic World*. Ed. by C. Mann, S. Remijsen, and S. Scharff. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2016, 131–152.
- Megow 1997**
Wolf-Rüdiger Megow. "Tychon". In *Lexikon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*. Zürich and Munich: Artemis & Winkler, 1997, Col. 141 cat. no. 2.
- Michalowski 1930**
Casimir Michalowski. "Les Hermès du Gymnase de Délos". *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 54 (1930), 131–146.
- Michalowski 1932**
Casimir Michalowski. *Les portraits hellénistiques et romains*. Exploration Archéologique de Délos faite par l'École française d'Athènes. fasc. 13. Paris: De Boccard, 1932.
- Nielsen 1990**
Inge Nielsen. *Thermae et Balnea. The Architecture and Cultural History of Roman Public Baths*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1990.
- Palagia 2000**
Olga Palagia. "Sculptures from the Peloponnese in the Roman Imperial Period". In *Roman Peloponnese 3. Society, Economy and Culture under the Roman Empire: Continuity and Innovation*. Μελετήματα 63. Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, Institute for Greek and Roman Antiquity, 2000.
- Peek 1955**
Werner Peek. *Griechische Vers-Inschriften. Grab-Epigramme*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1955.
- Petrakos 1999**
Vasileios Petrakos. *Ο Δήμος του Ραμνούντος: σύνοψη των ανασκαφών και των ερευνών (1813–1998). I. Τοπογραφία*. Athens: The Archaeological Society at Athens, 1999.
- Pfuhl and Möbius 1977**
Ernst Pfuhl and Hans Möbius. *Die ostgriechischen Grabreliefs I*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1977.
- Raubitschek 1949**
Antony E. Raubitschek. "Phaidros and his Roman Pupils". *Hesperia* 18 (1949), 101–103.
- Richter 1965**
Gisela M. A. Richter. *The Portraits of the Greeks III*. London: Phaidon Press, 1965.
- Roscher 1965**
Wilhelm Heinrich Roscher, ed. *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*. Hildesheim: Olms, 1965.
- Rückert 1998**
Birgit Rückert. *Die Herme im öffentlichen und privaten Leben der Griechen. Untersuchungen zur Funktion der griechischen Herme als Grenzmal, Inschriftträger und Kultbild des Hermes*. Theorie und Forschung Religionswissenschaften 563. Regensburg: Roderer, 1998.
- Scherer 1912**
Christian Scherer. "Hermes". In *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft VII 1*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1912, 786–787.
- Segre 1993**
Mario Segre. *Iscrizioni di Cos 1*. Roma: Erma di Bretschneider, 1993.
- Sève 1996**
Michel Sève. "Un enterrement public dans une épigramme d'Aigialè d'Amorgos (IG XII,7 447)". *Revue des études grecques* 109 (1996), 683–688.
- Siska 1933**
Heinz Siska. *De Mercurio ceterisque deis ad artem gymnasticam pertinentibus*. PhD thesis. Halle, 1933.
- Stéphanidou-Tiveriou 2009**
Theodosia Stéphanidou-Tiveriou. "Les héros de Palatiano. Une nouvelle proposition de restitution et d'interprétation du groupe statuaire". *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 133 (2009), 345–387.
- Themeles 2000**
Petros G. Themeles. "Ἡρώες και Ἡρώα στη Μεσσήνη". *Βιβλιοθήκη της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας* 210. Athens: The Archaeological Society at Athens, 2000.
- Themeles 2001**
Petros G. Themeles. "Das Gymnasion von Messene in der römischen Zeit". *Hefte des Archäologischen Seminars der Universität Bern* 4. Beiheft (2001), 9–20.
- Trombetti 2013**
Catia Trombetti. *Il ginnasio greco. Genesi, topografia e culti dei luoghi della paideia*. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2013.
- Tuchelt 1979**
Klaus Tuchelt. *Frühe Denkmäler Roms in Kleinasien: Beiträge zur archäologischen Überlieferung aus der Zeit der Republik und des Augustus*. Tübingen: E. Wasmuth, 1979.

Vérilhac 1982

Anne-Marie Vérilhac. *Paides aoroi. Poésie funéraire. Vol. 2 commentaire*. Athens: Academy of Athens, 1982.

Vössing 2004

Konrad Vössing. *Mensa Regia. Das Bankett beim hellenistischen König und bei römischen Kaiser*. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 193. Munich: De Gruyter, 2004.

Voutiras 2001

Emmanuel Voutiras. "Zur Aufstellung und Datierung des Aristotelesporträts". In *Wissenschaft mit Enthusiasmus: Beiträge zu antiken Bildnissen und zur historischen Landeskunde*, Klaus Fittschen gewidmet. Ed. by J. Bergemann. Internationale Archäologie, Studia honoraria 14. Rahden/Westf.: Marie Leidorf, 2001, 123–143.

Willers 1967

Dietrich Willers. "Zum Hermes Propylaios des Alkamenos". *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 82 (1967), 37–109.

Wrede 1981

Henning Wrede. *Consecratio in formam deorum. Vergöttlichte Privatpersonen in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1981.

Wrede 1986

Henning Wrede. *Die antike Herme, Trierer Beiträge zur Altertumskunde*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1986.

Zachos 1994

Konstantinos L. Zachos. "Αρχαιολογικές έρευνες στο γυμνάσιο της Ακτίας Νικοπόλεως". In *Φηγός. Τιμητικός τόμος για τον καθηγητή Σωτήρη Δάκαρη*. Ioannina, 1994, 443–457.

Zanker 1965

Paul Zanker. *Wandel der Hermesgestalt in der attischen Vasenmalerei*. Bonn: Habelt, 1965.

Zanker 1995

Paul Zanker. *Die Maske des Sokrates. Das Bild des Intellektuellen in der antiken Kunst*. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995.

Illustration credits

1 D-DAI-ATH. 2 D-DAI-ATH. 3–4 Society of Messenian Archaeological Studies (photo archive). 5 Museum of Casts and Antiquities of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (photo archive: AGME 1249 A). 6 École française d'archéologie d'Athènes (photo archive). 7 Museum of Casts and Antiquities of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (photo archive).

NATALIA KAZAKIDI

Natalia Kazakidi, Ph. D. in Classical Archaeology, is member of the teaching personnel at the History and Archaeology Department of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. Her research focuses on Hellenistic and Roman sculpture as well as on cultural information systems. She participates in several large research projects, among them the publication of sculptures in the Museums of Athens and Thessaloniki and the development of the information System *Sculpture and Society in Roman Greece*.

Dr. Natalia Kazakidi
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
Department of History and Archaeology
54124 Thessaloniki, Greece
E-Mail: natali@hist.auth.gr, natali.kasakidi@gmail.com

Ralf von den Hoff

Ruler Portraits and Ruler Cult in the Pergamon Gymnasion

Summary

A large number of archaeological and epigraphic testimonia refer to statues of Attalid kings in the gymnasion of Pergamon. The various records and media have not yet been systematically correlated. This article aims to compile and describe the corpus of royal statues installed in the Pergamon gymnasion during the Hellenistic period, as well as to assess the function of these statues and their importance for royal representation in the gymnasion. Particular focus is on the relationship between royal statues and the ruler cult practiced in the gymnasion as well as how these statues were preserved and transformed until Late Antiquity. Visual integration and visual continuity seem to have played a major role in this process.

Keywords: gymnasion; Pergamon; royal portraits; ruler cult; Hellenistic kings

Zu Bildnisstatuen attalidischer Könige im Gymnasion von Pergamon besitzen wir vielfältige archäologische und epigraphische Zeugnisse. Systematisch wurden aber die Zusammenhänge dieser unterschiedlichen Zeugnisgruppen bisher nicht untersucht. Der Beitrag zielt darauf ab, den Bestand an Herrscher-

bildnissen im Gymnasion von Pergamon zu bestimmen und ihre Funktionen und Rolle im Rahmen der Pergamenischen Herrscherrepräsentation im gymnasialen Raum zu beschreiben. Vor allem wird herausgearbeitet, in welchem Bezug die Bildnisse zum Herrscherkult standen, der dort praktiziert wurde, und wie sie bis zur Spätantike bewahrt oder umgestaltet wurden. Visuelle Integration und visuelle Kontinuität erscheinen dabei als die wichtigsten Konzepte.

Keywords: Gymnasium; Pergamon; königliche Portraits; Herrscherkult; hellenistische Könige

My thanks go to Ulrich Mania and Monika Trümper for inviting me to the Berlin gymnasium conference. Verena Stappmanns provided parts of her building documentation, Helmut Müller granted me access to his new editions of the inscriptions of Pergamon (Dekrete 1997; Müller 1997b), and the Pergamon excavation under the direction of Felix Pirson offered me the finest work opportunities and publication permissions. I am exceedingly grateful.

Over the past decade, new and intensified research has increased our knowledge of the great gymnasium of the Hellenistic royal capital of Pergamon in its early state, during the period in the first half of the second century BCE when it was established by the Attalid king Eumenes II.¹ The vast, architecturally ambitious terrace facility² reaches its conceptual and architectural zenith on the upper terrace with hall H, which is approximately 30 m wide.³ There, in a rectangular niche 6.4 m wide and 2.8 m deep, built into the center of the back wall of the room, stood a semicircular statue base made of local andesite (Figs. 1–2).⁴

The base supported the installation of Attalid statues of approximately 3 to 4 m in height – armored and barefoot – on the right and left side of a slightly larger statue of Heracles in the center.⁵ The famous head of a portrait statue presumed to be Attalos I, and a larger-than-life head of Heracles, both now in Berlin, have since been proved to have been part of these statues, and of the decoration of the gymnasium in the early second century BCE.⁶ The remains of the armored statues and the Heracles head belong to the workshop surroundings of the Pergamon altar, which fits in with the construction period of the gymnasium. The surviving base in the niche

created for it belonged to the original building stock of the gymnasium, there are no traces of its expansion,⁷ and the remains of the surviving statues likewise date back to the original construction period, which means there is no reason to doubt that the group of five statues in total was erected there under Eumenes II. The dimensions of the base, which has a front edge length of about 7 m, illustrate that it was originally used with two portrait statues on each side, that is to the right and left of Heracles.⁸ Because of the customary symmetry of such statuary groups, the larger Heracles figure should be positioned in the center.

But how does this royal and divine statue group relate to the epigraphic finds? Until now, the sculpture finds and the inscription testimony have been rather unsystematically grouped together, which identifies the few that have survived on the one hand with the few that are known on the other.⁹ This method is not without its problems, which will be examined below. Above all, the question arises as to which functions ruler statues fulfilled in the High Hellenistic Pergamon gymnasium and how they related to the ruler cult practiced there.

- 1 This article was written as part of the research on the Pergamon gymnasium funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) until 2011, and within the Berlin Sculpture Network finalized in 2013 (see Scholl 2016). It seeks to clarify and revise ideas from studies on statues in the Pergamon gymnasium (von den Hoff 2004, 382–391) that preceded this project and have since been advanced and corrected; some results have already been implied in earlier papers (von den Hoff 2011; von den Hoff and Petersen 2011; von den Hoff 2015a); others can only be substantiated in a more comprehensive publication that is still pending. The following text and its references were finalized in 2017.
- 2 On the Hellenistic gymnasium at Pergamon see Schazmann 1923; Delorme 1960, 171–191; Wörrle 2000, 504; Radt 2011, 113–146; 357; Trümper 2015, 172–196 with fig. 3–4; cf. also Trombetti 2013. More recently on the architecture and dating see Wörrle 2007, 508 (“königliches Geschenk”); Stappmanns 2011, 29–37; von den Hoff, Mathys, and Stappmanns 2011; Stappmanns 2012 with fig. 2; Stappmanns 2014; Stappmanns 2015; von den Hoff 2015a with fig. 3–4. On new restoration work see Bachmann 2013, 146–157; Bachmann 2014, 170–173; Bachmann 2015, 168–174. On the relation of the new Eumenic city to the road network, given only by possible views, cf. Pirson 2011a, 121–122 fig. 58; Pirson 2011b, 71 fig. 6.
- 3 Schazmann 1923, 58–61 with pl. 4–5; Radt 2011, 126–127; von den Hoff, Mathys, and Stappmanns 2011, 273 with fig. 5; von den Hoff 2015a, 127 with note 34 fig. 5; von den Hoff 2015b, 59–60 with note 28 fig. 13.
- 4 Schazmann 1923, 59 with pl. 4–5. 20; Radt and Filgis 1986, 119 note 396; von den Hoff 2004, 383–384 with note 77 (with further literature); von den Hoff 2015a, 127–128 fig. 5. On the graffiti on the base see Schazmann 1923, 59; Radt and Filgis 1986, 119 note 396; von den Hoff 2004, 388 note 105; Radt 2011, 127.
- 5 Recent work: Queyrel 2003, 41–49; von den Hoff 2004, 383–384; 386–387 fig. 8 (still presuming only *one* armored statue; the portrait head of Alexander the Great from fig. 9 mentioned there was not found in the same place); Laube 2006, 78–82; von den Hoff and Mathys 2011, 40 fig. 2–3; von den Hoff 2011, 128–129 fig. 6–7; von den Hoff 2015a, 127–129 fig. 11–13; 15. On the height of the armored statues see Queyrel 2003, 43. Radt and Filgis 1986, 119–120 note 397–398 considers it possible that the statues did not originate until the first century BCE, but this is based on equating them with the sculptures associated with Diodoros Paspalos in the inscriptions and assuming only one of the possible additions to these inscription texts; see below.
- 6 Auinger 2015 with fig. 1–2; cf. Radt and Filgis 1986, 119 note 397. So-called Attalos I., Berlin, Antikensammlung SMB Inv. AvP VII 130: Grüßinger, Kästner, and Scholl 2011, 499 Kat. 5.8 (R. von den Hoff); von den Hoff 2013b with further literature; Scholl 2016, 52–54 no. 36 (R. von den Hoff – C. Blume). Head of Heracles, Berlin, Antikensammlung SMB Inv. Sk 1675: Grüßinger, Kästner, and Scholl 2011, 462 Kat. 3.27 (R. von den Hoff); von den Hoff 2013a with further literature; Picón and Hemingway 2016, 151 no. 57 (R. von den Hoff).
- 7 On the later reduction of the base width see below.
- 8 The well-preserved plinth with feet, which presumably belongs to the armored statues (von den Hoff 2015a, 128 with note 42 fig. 15), measures approx. 70 cm in width, so that at least 90–100 cm of space on the circular arc must be estimated for each statue, and even more for the larger Heracles figure in the middle.
- 9 Following, e.g., von den Hoff 2004, 383–384, 386–390 (before the new studies in Pergamon and Berlin); von den Hoff 2015a, 128.




Fig. 1 Niche with statue base in hall H of the upper gymnasium terrace.

1 Attalid statues in the Diodoros inscriptions

The first important epigraphic information can be found in a decree by the Pergamenes honoring Diodoros Paspas.¹⁰ It belongs to the era just after his gymnasiarchy (69 BCE), and its text was made available to the public in the gymnasium (Fig. 3).¹¹

According to this text, a statue (ἄγαλμα) of Diodoros was placed in an exedra of the gymnasium

where a likeness of Philetairos (282–263 BCE), the first autonomous Attalid ruler of the city, had been installed (l. 36).¹² A little before this mention of the exedra of the statue of Philetairos, there is discussion of an agalma of the same Philetairos Euergetes (l. 19–20). A missing patch of the text (l. 20) leaves it unclear whether Diodoros installed this likeness for the first time (ἀνατιθέναι) or merely had it newly erected or repaired (ἐπισκευάσαι).¹³ The latter addition seems more plausible, but Diodoros was considered the new founder of the

10 On Diodoros Paspas see Jones 1974; Chankowski 1998; Jones 2000; Müller 2003, 434–435; 437–438; Ameling 2004, 142–145; Genovese 2011, 67–70; Meier 2012, 336–341; Mathys 2014, 51–54.

11 Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1904, 152–160 no. 1 with appendix; pl. 16; OGIS pl. 764; Müller 1997b (“AM 29, 1904, no. 1”); Chankowski 1998, 162 no. I; 192–194; <http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/316574> (visited on 17/10/2018). Jones 1974, 191 proposes dating this decree to earlier than the others for Diodoros; on the chronology cf. Chankowski 1998.

12 On its identification with the first important Attalid in Pergamon, Philetairos, cf. Wörle 2000, 553 with note 53. Another agalma of Diodoros as σύνθρονος of the gymnasium gods (Heracles and Hermes), is expected to have stood in another exedra of the gymnasium. See Hepding 1907, 257–

272 no. 8 a l. 44–45; still another is mentioned in I. Pergamon 256, cf. Chankowski 1998, 163 no. III; 173–217. On the statues of Diodoros cf. Mathys 2014, 51–54.

13 Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1904, 152–160 no. 1; Queyrel 2003, 30; von den Hoff 2004, 388; von den Hoff, Mathys, and Stappmanns 2011, 276 and von den Hoff 2011, 128 add ἐπισκευάσαι (“to repair”) in l. 20 (on archaeological references to repairs cf. below); on this term cf., e.g., Hepding 1910, 401–407 no. 1 b l. 11. ἀνατιθέναι (“to install”) is added by Müller 1997b (“AM 29, 1904, no. 1”); Chankowski 1998, 191 note 128, in line with <http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/316574> (visited on 17/10/2018).



Fig. 2 Niche with statue base in hall H of the upper gymnasium terrace.

gymnasium after the Mithridatic destruction.¹⁴ He is not likely to have been concerned with the statues of long-dead kings that were not visible before the wartime destruction in the gymnasium.¹⁵ In any case, the Philetairos portrait is probably that statue mentioned shortly thereafter in the text of the same decree as standing in an exedra, near which a likeness of Diodoros was then also erected, precisely because of his concern for this portrait of Philetairos.¹⁶ So here we learn about *one* Philetairos

statue, which was an *agalma*. Diodoros had at least one other statue of a king erected or repaired: an *agalma* of Attalos III Philometor (138–133 BC) that is mentioned in the same text (l. 20), after the Philetairos likeness. Diodoros' benevolence with the royal portraits is also highlighted in another inscription dossier inscribed on a column of the upper gymnasium terrace.¹⁷

It is not certain from these texts that the two Attalid portrait statues were only in one room of the gymna-

14 Hepding 1907, 257–272 no. 8 a II l. 62–63.

15 But cf. the other context in Hepding 1907, 265–272 no. 8 b–c Z. 17–19.

16 Sacrifices were made for the kings during the consecration of the Diodoros statue; see Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1904, 152–160 no. 1 l. 39–40; Wörle 2000, 553.

17 Hepding 1907, 265–272 8 b–c l. 17–19; Müller 1997b (“AM 32, 1907, no. 8”); Chankowski 1998, 163–165 no. VI; 175–180; 190–191; <http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/316601> (visited on 17/10/2018); cf. also Meier 2012, 334–341 no. 48.




Fig. 3 Honoric inscription for Diodoros Pasparos from the Pergamon gymnasium ("AM 29, 1904, no. 1").

sion or installed on one base. In addition, it is unclear if there were further likenesses of other persons. Along with the indications of the two statues, the texts mentioned have several parts missing. First, the lacuna in lines 19 and 20 of the first Diodoros decree is significant.¹⁸ It precedes the name of Philetairos and that of Attalos III, with Philetairos immediately following. It is difficult to add the names of other Pergamenian rulers here – there would be space for two – and thus attest to their agalmata, such as those of Eumenes I and Attalos I.¹⁹ The names would then not be listed in chronological order, which is a problem. At a later point in the same inscription (l. 39) sacrifices for Philetairos are mentioned, and Attalos III immediately follows. There is uncertainty as to whether this was followed by the name of another ruler, who would then be an earlier king (Eumenes II?)²⁰ – and thus not in chronological order.²¹ This would still result in only three kings being listed. Unfortunately, the naming of the statues in the large Diodoros dossier also has elements missing;²² before the name of Philetairos (l. 17), and perhaps also before Attalos III (l. 19).²³ No conclusive proposal to fill in these lacunae has yet been made.²⁴ The Diodoros dossier remains unclear with regard to the number of royal statues and the persons portrayed. Statues next to those of Philetairos and Attalos

III are conceivable, but not definitively determinable.²⁵ If we leave the statue of Attalos III aside, which certainly only arrived in the gymnasium after 138 BCE and therefore was not part of the original decoration, then the lacunae offer too little space to name more than two Attalid agalmata in the gymnasium besides that of Philetairos, at least in the founding phase.²⁶

2 Other Attalid statues

In addition to the indications from the Diodoros inscriptions, fragments of four marble bases also attest to portrait statues of Attalids in the gymnasium before Attalos III. The first fragment is the left part of a base block that names Attalos I as a *soter*, in the accusative case (Fig. 4).²⁷

Found on the upper terrace of the gymnasium, the fragment belongs to a statue base which, according to its inscription and connecting surface at the left, continued for at least one block. The letter height of about 5 cm is relatively large; the statue would have been slightly oversized. The holes on the top surface suggest a bronze statue of the first king of Pergamon. Another likeness of this king is probably attested by a block, later reused, of

18 Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1904, 152–160 no. 1 l. 19–20.

19 According to Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1904, 152–160 no. 1 l. 19, followed by Müller 1997b (“AM 29, 1904, no. 1”); Chankowski 1998, 191 note 128; already similar in W. Dittenberger (OGIS no. 764); cf. Wörrle 2000, 553.

20 This has now been added by Müller 1997b (“AM 29, 1904, no. 1”), as well as the earlier W. Dittenberger (OGIS no. 764); Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1904, 152–160 no. 1 l. 39 does not list another name here.

21 The missing text in front of the statue of Philetairos in Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1904, 152–160 no. 1 l. 19–20 (and potentially also in Hepding 1907, 265–272 no. 8 b–c l. 17–18), could also mention a statue of Seleukos I, with whom Philetairos initially aligned himself in order to make Pergamon independent. But this would have been out of the question, since Seleukos obviously received no cult in Pergamon. In Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1904, 152–160 no. 1 l. 39, which deals with sacrifices, he would thus rightly be missing from before Philetairos. The king who may have followed Attalos III, by contrast, did receive sacrifices, but then had no statue in the gymnasium, since he would not otherwise have been named under the agalmata following Attalos III. At least one statue (εἰκών) of the non-local king Ptolemy existed in the gymnasium (Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1904, 152–160 no. 1 l. 42: Ptolemaios; cf. Kotsidou 2000, 469 K., no. 352), but this dates to after the end of Attalid rule; but cf. the statue of Antiochos III from the sanctuary of Athena: I. Pergamon 182. I do not consider a statue of Seleukos to have been plausible in the gymnasium during the era of conflicts between Pergamon and the Seleucids in the early second century BCE, when the gymnasium was built; cf. the discussion about the naming of the presumed Attalos I, who

is also interpreted as Seleukos I, von den Hoff 2013b and below.

22 Hepding 1907, 265–272 no. 8 b–c l. 17–19; Virgilio 1993, 91 note 411 Müller 1997b (“AM 32, 1907, no. 8”); Chankowski 1998, 190–191. There is also missing text about the sacrifices of two bulls for kings after a decision to celebrate Athena and Asclepios: Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1904, 152–160 no. 1 l. 46–48.

23 Chankowski 1998, 190–191 with note 123. He considers Eumenes or Attalos for the lacuna in l. 17 preceding Philetairos, but the singular form of the corresponding adjective (καθιδρυμένου) would require explanation.

24 It is possible that no other agalma is named in l. 18 before Attalos III, since only Hepding 1907 reads “A” here, H. Müller later saw “AN”: Müller 1997b (“AM 32, 1907, no. 8”); Chankowski 1998, 190 note 123.

25 Cf. Wörrle 2000, 553.

26 The text in Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1904, 152–160 no. 1 l. 46–48 talks about two bulls as sacrificial animals in the context of Diodoros Paspas; they were sacrificed to the rulers in relation to the decision about a celebration of Athena and Asclepios. This could indicate that here, too, two rulers received sacrifices (cf. von den Hoff 2004, 388 note 108), but Müller 1997b (“AM 29, 1904, No. 1”) adds in Attalos I Theos before the names of Philetairos and Attalos III, inserting a third, older king in non-chronological order; Schwarzer 1999, 261 also sees Attalos I Theos named here; cf. Wörrle 2000, 553.

27 Hepding 1907, 301–311 no. 32; Dekrete 1997 (honorific inscriptions: “AM 32, 1907, no. 32”); von den Hoff 2004, 383 note 75; http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/316621 (visited on 17/10/2018).



Fig. 4 Fragment of the base of a statue of Attalos I from the gymnasium ("AM 32, 1907, no. 32").



Fig. 5 Reused block of the base of a statue for Attalos I from the gymnasium ("AM 32, 1907, no. 48 a + b").

another statue base from the gymnasium (Fig. 5).²⁸

According to the addition by Helmut Müller, this portrait was dedicated to Attalos I by a certain Menestratos. However, the text should only be extrapolated with great caution. The smaller letter size (height 2.4 cm) confirms that this was probably a somewhat smaller statue. The statue was a dedication to Attalos which advocates cult activities.

The marble block that supported a portrait statue of a Eumenes (Fig. 6) also belongs to a base with a rather small inscription.²⁹

It was found as a secondary closing wall of the door leading to room O in the west part of the upper gymnasium terrace. The block seems to have supported a life-size or slightly larger-than-life-size statue. Jacobsthal

mentions a pin hole for attaching a lance to the top surface, which might indicate a statue type that was nude or partly clothed. It was donated by Philetairos, the first name mentioned in the inscription: son of an Attalos, the father of the figure depicted. This would then be Philetairos Euergetes, who donated a portrait of his adoptive son Eumenes, who would later rule Pergamon beginning in 263 BCE. If we take this literally, then the donation was made during the lifetime of Philetairos, long before the construction of the gymnasium in the early third century BCE. The two statues of Attalos I could also have been set up in the third century BCE. A similar case exists with the fourth base of a royal statue from the gymnasium: this is the round base of a bronze statue of 78 cm in diameter, which was found in 1908 in

28 Hepding 1907, 320 no. 48a + b; Dekrete 1997 (honorific inscriptions: "AM 32, 1907, no. 48 a"; "AM 32, 1907, no. 48 b"); Mathys 2014, 50; fig. 10; 138 Gy U8; <http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/316636> (visited on 17/10/2018); <http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/316637> (visited on

17/10/2018).

29 Jacobsthal 1908, 405 no. 34, Dekrete 1997 (honorific inscriptions: "AM 33, 1908, no. 34"); von den Hoff 2004, 381 note 75; <http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/316913> (visited on 17/10/2018).



Fig. 6 Block of the base of a statue of Eumenes (I) from the gymnasium ("AM 33, 1908, no. 34").

the east baths adjacent to the gymnasium (Fig. 7).³⁰

The typical insertion hole on the top surface indicates that this base too supported a life-size or slightly taller bronze statue. The inscription states that Eumenes, son of Philetairos, erected this statue of Attalos, his son. This is therefore the remains of another statue of Attalos, who would later rule Pergamon as its first king until 197 BCE. This raises the question of whether we can give credence to this text in chronological terms as well: the likeness would then have been created before 241 BC, too early for it to have been installed in the gymnasium first. Could the base have been brought there later? It can never be ruled out that such stone blocks did end up being carried off in Late Antiquity and the Byzantine era, but it is equally unlikely that the statue was transferred there when the gymnasium was first being decorated. The inscription formula is identical to the base of Eumenes I just discussed (Fig. 6), and the letter heights

match (2 cm). The portraits were therefore characterized as companion pieces,³¹ even if the base shapes and writing differ in the details. But we do not know of any find from the gymnasium that is certain to have come from one of the places of origin of such statues, which have been suggested, the neighboring sanctuary of Demeter, or the sanctuary of Athena, high up on the citadel.³² Apparently fragments only came directly crashing down from the Hera sanctuary above the gymnasium palaestra and the adjacent 'temple R'.³³ This leaves us with an unproven but probable proposition: assume that there was an ancient installation of these statues in the gymnasium, either through the installation of older statues – most likely during the original decoration – or through the suggestion of an older donation inscription.³⁴

30 Hepding 1910, 463–465 no. 45 fig. 5; Dekrete 1997 (honorific inscriptions: "AM 35, 1910, no. 45"); von den Hoff 2004, 383 note 75; von den Hoff 2011, 123–124 fig. 3; <http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/316993> (visited on 17/10/2018).

31 Hepding 1910, 465.

32 Schober 1951, 51 ("wohl verschleppt") and Queyrel 2003, 81 note 7 ("sans doute du sanctuaire d'Athéna") assume that the base was taken; von den Hoff 2004, 383 with note 75 is similar. Finds from the sanctuary of Demeter (?) in the gymnasium: marble fragments of Nike figures (Bergama, Depot der Pergamongrabung no. S 167; S 151), Hepding 1910, 495–497. Grote 1992a, 180 pl. 15, 2; and Grote 1992b, no. 405, however, identifies Akroter figures in it from a 'temple R' west of the gymnasium, similarly to Rheidt 1996, 178.

33 Objects from the Hera sanctuary in the gymnasium: fragment of the dedication inscription, Jacobsthal 1908, 402 no. 27; altar of a Hera priestess, Jacobsthal 1908, 402 no. 28. Objects from "temple R" in the gymnasium: fragment of a marble cult image, Radt 2011, 131 fig. 75 (found in the west baths of the gymnasium).

34 Jacobsthal 1908, 405 considers the letters on the base Jacobsthal 1908, 405 no. 34 (Abb. 6) to be those of the second century BCE, as in Dekrete 1997 (honorific inscriptions: "AM 33, 1908, no. 34"); von den Hoff 2011, 126, unlike Hepding 1910, 465, who also dates the base, Hepding 1910, 436–465 no. 45 (fig. 7), as does Dekrete 1997 (honorific inscriptions: "AM 35, 1910, no. 45"), to the third century BCE. Dekrete 1997 (honorific inscriptions: "AM 32, 1907, no. 48 a") also dates the base Hepding 1907, 320 no. 48a (fig. 5) to this period.



Fig. 7 Fragment of the base of a statue of Attalos (I) from the gymnasium ("AM 35, 1910, no. 45").

3 Portrait statues, findings, and inscriptions

Bringing these epigraphic and archaeological findings together is not easy. No statue has been preserved with its matching inscription. The precise locations in the gymnasium of the epigraphically attested statues cannot be determined. Their sheer number, however, shows that royal statues were present in many rooms. The agalmata of Philetairos and Attalos III named in the Diodoros inscriptions must by no means have stood in one room, let alone on one base; it is unclear whether more statues were named there. And the number (four) of colossal marble Attalid statues already installed in hall H under Eumenes II, together on one base from which remnants have survived, surpasses the maximum achievable number, derived from the texts of the Diodoros dossier, of three kings' agalmata before Attalos III. Whether these are even the agalmata named there is likewise an open question.³⁵

What is striking is that only the statue finds in hall H have so far given indications of royal statues before the time of Attalos III that were made of marble and clearly oversized. They were accentuated by their materials and size – as well as by the prominent situation of their loca-

tion. They – and not yet the incomplete epigraphic evidence – also testify so far to an early, cohesive gallery of Attalid portraits, even if we cannot be sure who exactly was depicted. The other royal statues attested only epigraphically (Figs. 4–7), were made of bronze and not linked to common bases. Only for Philetairos is there not yet any indication of a statue in the gymnasium except for his agalma; but his statue probably would not have been missing from a family group. All this supports recognizing the agalma of Philetairos as one of the statues in the central niche of hall H.³⁶ This would have the consequence of hall H being cited as the exedra of Philetairos, as the first Diodoros decree refers to it. A portrait (*agalma*) of Diodoros would then also have had to have been present there since the first century BCE.³⁷ But this identification is far from being sure: early remains of rectangular foundations have been observed in rooms G and D, and they too may have belonged to statue bases that were later removed.³⁸ Apart from this, it may come as a surprise that a single statue from the cluster of four Attalid likenesses, which had been jointly and simultaneously installed, was ascribed a special status and that this alone gave the room its name, as the Diodoros inscription attests.³⁹

Was there a recognizable message of this corpus of

35 It is possible, but not compulsory, to assume a jointly installed gallery of Attalids on *one* base in the early gymnasium on the basis of the Diodoros inscriptions *alone*, as in Radt and Filgis 1986, 119–120 with note 398; Virgilio 1993, 91–92; Schwarzer 1999, 261–262, and also von den Hoff 2004, 388 with note 108; and von den Hoff 2011, 128, since the statue of Philetairos is also individually named. But cf. the skepticism in Aneziri and Damaskos 2004, 265 note 123, and in Bielfeldt 2010, 160 with note 117–118, who seem to doubt a statue gallery at all, even though the finds of statues from hall H are evidence of such a gallery (thus also rightly

Bielfeldt 2010, 163 note 124).

36 The Philetairos exedra is identified as hall H in Delorme 1960, 188–189; Radt and Filgis 1986, 119–120; Chankowski 1998, 173; von den Hoff 2004, 388.

37 Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1904, 152–160 no. 1 l. 36 (see note 11 above); cf. von den Hoff 2004, 386 with note 99.

38 von den Hoff 2015a, 129 with note 56 (but not demonstrated with any certainty as having been the foundations of statue bases).

39 On this see von den Hoff 2004, 386 note 99.

Attalid statues at the time when the gymnasium was established, as far as we can determine? It became clear that at least two portraits of members of the Attalid royal dynasty stood in the gymnasium of Eumenes, which displayed ‘princes’ and had been erected by family members (Figs. 6–7). Through their inscriptions, which name the person depicted and the donor as son and father, respectively, they firmly marked the male generational succession starting with Philetairos followed by Eumenes I and Attalos I – and thus showed the continuity of rule as legitimate, even though adoptions were part of it.⁴⁰ In addition, there were the two statues of Attalos I (Figs. 4–5) and the four Attalid statues next to Heracles in the central niche of hall H. Under Eumenes II, then, the gymnasium was filled with statues of kings and of later kings portrayed before their accession to power – a space strongly visually occupied by the Attalids.⁴¹ At the same time, the statues of the young princes may also have directly spoken to the gymnasium visitors, most of whom were young. At least two of the likenesses were made of bronze; only the statues in hall H were definitely marble, and only these reached a significantly larger-than-life format. The shapes of the bases (Figs. 4–7) also show that the individual portraits were not installed as a cohesive group of statues and therefore were presumably arranged around the space: the Attalids were thus seen in the gymnasium as isolated figures and as representatives of different age roles. According to their inscriptions, the Attalid portraits were not cult statues, but honorifics or donations by members of the royal family – in a space whose statuary decoration was designed by the ruling family it-

self.⁴² For the figure group in hall H, by contrast, which was installed by Eumenes II at the time he established the gymnasium, there is an emphasis on the ties between the persons depicted and with Heracles, the divine patron of the gymnasium, who was also considered the ancestor of the Pergamon royal family.⁴³ The dynastic and collective aspect of the representation of these rulers is also underscored here. The uniform military quality of the Attalids is especially foregrounded in this room, as it seems that at least two, if not four statues in armored breastplates were set before the viewer.⁴⁴

4 The ruler cult and ruler portraits: visual integration

How do the Attalid statues relate to ruler cult practices in the Pergamon gymnasium? The Attalid ruler cult is a controversial field; the space here does not permit a discussion of the ruler cult in its entirety, or the necessary differentiation between urban cults and so-called dynastic cults – as specifically these may have been formed in the royal capital of Pergamon in particular.⁴⁵ Proof of ruler cults is found primarily in the epigraphic references to priests, sacrifices, and dedications to rulers, as well as in indications of cult sites.⁴⁶ Priests of Philetairos, of the Theoi Adelphoi Eumenes II and Attalos II, and of Attalos III – the last while he was still alive – are known to have been present in Pergamon itself in the late second century BCE.⁴⁷ We know of altars to Attalos I that were already being dedicated during his lifetime;⁴⁸ there

40 Following Hepding 1910, 464–465.

41 Following von den Hoff 2015a, 130.

42 Only in the case of a statue conditionally related to Attalos I (Fig. 5) may the dative case in the name of the person depicted indicate a consecration to him: Hepding 1907, 320 no. 48a.

43 Scheer 1993, 110–149; Schwarzer 1999, 259; Platz-Horster 2013.

44 This essentially also confirms the connection to military training posited by Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 65; but cf. Wörrle 2007, 508 with note 36.

45 For this cf. Habicht 1970; Price 1984, 23–53; Walbank 1987; Herz 1996; Chaniotis 2003; Aneziri and Damaskos 2004, 262–268; Buraselis and Aneziri 2004; Chankowski 2010; Erskine 2014; Coppola 2016; as well as the anthologies Iossif 2011; Günther 2011. On the ruler cult in Pergamon see Schwarzer 1999; Wörrle 2000, 550–554; Gauthier 2003; Bielfeldt 2010, 152–163; Schwarzer 2011; Michels 2011, 117–124.

46 Aneziri and Damaskos 2004, 262. – The inscription for the establishment of an urban cult for Antigonos I in Skepsis lists *temenos*, *bomos*, and *agalma*, with sacrifices and celebration: OGIS no. 6; Habicht 1970, 42–44; Erskine 2014, 585–587; <http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/287868>

(visited on 17/10/2018).

47 On priests of Philetairos see Wörrle 2000; cf. Gauthier 2003. On priests of Attalos II see Jacobsthal 1908, 375–379 no. 1 l. 1–2. On priests of Theoi Adelphoi Eumenes II and Attalos II see Jacobsthal 1908, 375–379 no. 1 l. 3. On priests of Attalos III see Jacobsthal 1908, 375–379 no. 1 l. 4–5; I. Pergamon 246, l. 12–13, see also Müller 1992, 206–212. Cf. Wörrle 2000, 554 note 54.

48 Jacobsthal 1908, 403–404 no. 32: <http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/316911> (visited on 17/10/2018). I. Pergamon 43: <http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/301641> (visited on 17/10/2018). I. Pergamon 44: <http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/301642> (visited on 17/10/2018). SEG 40 no. 1134 B: <http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/317229> (visited on 17/10/2018). The king’s name appears in the genitive in I. Pergamon 45: <http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/301643> (visited on 17/10/2018). Cf. Schwarzer 1999, 256; Müller 2000, 540 note 112; Bielfeldt 2010, 155–156 fig. 14–15 (I. Pergamon 43 and 44 are depicted, and not I. Pergamon 45), as well as 156 with note 111 on other, more recent altars; Michels 2011, 120 note 40.

is evidence of an *Eumeneion*, a cult site for Eumenes II, on the hill of Pergamon's citadel, within the old city walls, in the district of Philetaira.⁴⁹ Eumenes II was also worshipped as Theos in conjunction with the Twelve Gods, in the waning years of the monarchy at the very latest.⁵⁰ An urban ruler cult may have begun in Pergamon under Eumenes I, but this is disputed.⁵¹

The situation is more modest for the Pergamon gymnasium, even though there were generally strong ties between gymnasia and the Hellenistic ruler cult.⁵² Sacrifices to Philetairos and Attalos III took place under Diodoros Paspáros – more than sixty years after the monarchy had ended – when Diodoros had their agalmata renovated.⁵³ If the agalma of Philetairos receiving the sacrifices was identical to one of the ruler statues in hall H, its installation would trace back to Eumenes II. The statue would then already include evidence of Eumenes' II visual and ritual legitimacy through the statue and cult of the dynasty's founder that were linked to this site. It is an open question whether the statue in hall H – if it depicted Philetairos – gave its name to hall H or another room – even though the statue was part of a group. The naming of a room alone, however, confirms its excellent quality against the other statues, indeed those of a *cult* image in a gymnasium-centered ruler cult. Michael Wörrle has recently clarified the accentuated role of the Pergamene Philetairos priests in the political and religious fabric of the Pergamon *polis* as a whole.⁵⁴

Further specifics about cult worship of the Attalids in the gymnasium cannot be given, except that one of the statues testified was probably dedicated to Attalos I there, as was made explicit by the inscription (Fig. 5), and that another Attalid was being worshipped there beginning with Attalos III at the latest. It cannot be determined, however, whether sacrifices to Attalos I, Eumenes II, or Attalos II were ever made in the gymnasium.

But we do know the visual and functional context of the rest of the ruler portraits in relation to what was likely the earliest cult statue of Philetairos, wherever it stood – so we also know the latest one, that of Attalos III. The Attalids were meant to appear on the one hand to be *related as a family*, but also as individuals and therefore as virtually normal citizens. The historical beginning was marked by the cult statue of Philetairos, while the uniform marble statues in hall H underscored the *dynastic unity* of the ruling family following him. But the names of those represented in the marble statues are open to debate. In addition to the obvious Philetairos, possible candidates are Eumenes II, the founder of the gymnasium, Eumenes I, but also the first king of Pergamon, Attalos I, as well as Attalos II, the brother of the gymnasium's founder. Arguments could be made in favor of each one, but it must be clarified which arguments would actually be apt – the 'completeness' of the genealogy, the kinship or adoption, their military accomplishments, or their historical relevance.⁵⁵ But the epigraphic findings make it clear even without such designations that not all of the rulers depicted in the gymnasium were also objects of cult worship at this site: probably not even all four Attalids who appeared in the marble statues of hall H. The result was a tense juxtaposition of cult practice, cult statue(s) and other portrait statues of rulers.

This opens up another component of the representation of the Pergamon monarchy in its royal capital's gymnasium. Just grouping the four marble statues in hall H together with Heracles – although he is represented as more significant in size – brings those depicted more into line with a divine hero who was worshipped in the gymnasium and was the progenitor of the ruling dynasty. This way the Attalids became *synnaoi theoi* of Heracles at least visually, without necessarily becoming subjects of the cult themselves.⁵⁶ If the cult statue of Phile-

49 I. Pergamon 240; OGIS no. 336; <http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/301878> (visited on 17/10/2018). On the Philetaira district cf. Wörrle 2000, 552. On the Eumeneion see Bielfeldt 2010, 158 with note 114.

50 I. Pergamon 246, l. 27–28; OGIS no. 332; <http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/301887> (visited on 17/10/2018).

51 Cf., e.g., Wörrle 2000; critical of this early dating is Bielfeldt 2010, 154–163; cf. also Gauthier 2003.

52 On the ruler cult in the Pergamon gymnasium and beyond see Delorme 1960, 342–346; Price 1984, 45; Aneziri and Damaskos 2004, 262–268; Buraselis and Aneziri 2004, 179; as well as Wörrle 2000; Wörrle 2007. A gymnasium in Athens was named after Ptolemy III and housed a statue of the king; Paus. 1, 17, 2.

53 Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1904, 152–160 no. 1 l. 35–40.

54 Wörrle 2000.

55 On the naming of the marble statues in H, cf. provisionally von den Hoff 2013b. As has now been shown, however, the kings' names mentioned in the Diodoros texts alone are no help in naming these statues. The controversial question of identifying the presumed Attalos I in Berlin (cf., eg. Fleischer 1991, 10–15) must be further discussed elsewhere; cf. the important replica of the head on the sarcophagus of the *tomba bella* in Himerapolis, Romeo, Panariti, and Ungaro 2014, 220–222 and Smith 2015, 809.

56 On *synnaoi theoi* cf. Schmidt-Dounas 1993–1994; Queyrel 2015. Joint installation therefore does not necessarily imply a joint cult, cf. Buraselis and Aneziri 2004, 179. Diodoros Paspáros later received an agalma in the gymnasium as a σύνθετος of Heracles and Hermes (Hepding 1907, 257–272 no. 8 a l. 44–45), so potentially a seated statue, cf. Chankowski 1998, 198–199.

tairos were to have been standing among their likenesses, this statue would have had a specific religious value, but it would not have been more prominent than the rest of the likenesses in terms of material, format, and perhaps even iconography. If the agalma of Philetairos had been in another place in the gymnasium, however, then it would have been an additional functional portrait category of cult statue in the context of the overall sculptural decoration, alongside the oversized marble likenesses and the life-size bronze portrait statues. In any case, there is a blurring of the clearly separated functions of the portraits: honorific, consecrated, and cult statues of the same persons were found distributed all over the gymnasium; visitors under the rule of Eumenes II were encouraged to see their separation as diversity, the implicit family ties between them as a moment of integration and of a nexus of honorific, cultic, and social (read: royal) status. In the light of the cult of Philetairos – should it trace back in the gymnasium to Eumenes II – and in the company of Heracles, a divine-religious aura was conferred upon kings and princes of the Attalid family that visually distinguished them and removed them from the everyday, even though specific practices of the ruler cult may at first have been assigned only to Philetairos, and then only under certain circumstances. The installation site near the cultically worshipped founder implicitly integrated the other family members into this cult.⁵⁷ The statuary decoration of the gymnasium made it a site of the union of civic and extraordinary religious as well as military qualities of the male members of the royal family – young and old – and this seems to have been a concept of its design by Eumenes II.

Attalid statues were not unique to the Pergamon gymnasium, however. Such statues are also attested in

the gymnasions of Andros, Apamea, and Sestos, where they sometimes served as cult statues. Groups of statues of several Attalids were also featured, and these are more frequently cited as evidence for the Attalids in general.⁵⁸ Elsewhere, too, Attalid likenesses alongside those of gods tied the Pergamon kings to the divine sphere – without having to cross the boundary into ‘equating’ the two or compelling cultic worship.⁵⁹ In this respect, the Pergamon gymnasium at best represents an exception, in view of the multitude of Attalid statues with diverse functions and the resulting visual connection between them.

5 Ruler portraits after the end of royal rule: visual continuity

Even after the monarchy ended, the gymnasium did not lose its eye-catching feature of the massive visual presence of the Attalids, in the form of their likenesses and their implicit integration into the cult of the dynasty’s founder. This alone shows the intensification of the ruler cult in the late Attalid era and the cult’s existence beyond the end of the monarchy, as Michael Wörrle has investigated.⁶⁰ This manifested itself specifically in the care Diodoros Paspáros devoted to the royal portraits in the gymnasium in approximately 69 BCE, when, as the “second founder” after the disaster of the Mithridatic wars, he conferred a new splendor on the structure and the institution.⁶¹ It cannot be inferred from the corresponding inscriptions with any certainty that Diodoros had ancient agalmata of the kings in the gymnasium repaired (and not originally installed), but this has already been indicated above as being rather probable. The analysis of

57 Perhaps comparable phenomena of a blurring of clear boundaries: 1) the sacrifices for the benefit of kings or their own cult (cf. Aneziri and Damaskos 2004, 263), 2) the conflation of celebrations for gods and for kings (Aneziri and Damaskos 2004, 265–266) and 3) relations between cult and honors. The case of Attalos III demonstrates this: he received a cult statue (ἄγαλμα) as a *synnaos theos* of Asclepios and a golden statue (εἰκών) on the agora, but his priest offered sacrifices at the altar of Zeus that was adjacent to the golden εἰκών; sacrifices were offered to Attalos III at the same time they were offered at the altar of Zeus Boulaios and Hera Boulaia in Pergamon, as attested in the ‘Elaia Decree’: I. Pergamon 246; OGIS no. 332; Müller 1992, 206–212; Schwarzer 1999, 260–261; Queyrel 2003, 37–39; Bielfeldt 2010, 180–182.

58 On Attalid cults and statues in other gymnasiums see Queyrel 2003, 34–36 (Andros: Eumenes II); 36 (Apamea: Eumenes II and Attalos II; no certain cult evidence); 37 (Sestos: Attalos III); cf. also the gold statue of Eumenes

II in the gymnasium (?) of Milet: Schwarzer 1999, 256–257; Queyrel 2003, 31–34. On statue groups of Attalids see von den Hoff 2011, 123; cf., e.g., the statue gallery donated by Menogenes in the sanctuary of Athena: I. Pergamon 171–176; Bielfeldt 2010, 165–166.

59 Attalid statues alongside images of gods: Attalos III in Pergamon next to Asclepios as *synnaos theos*: I. Pergamon 246; Attalids next to Hera in the Heraion of Pergamon under Attalos II (cf. recently Mathys 2014, 38–41; *pace* Schwarzer 1999, 295–298); colossal statue of Attalos I next to statue of Apollo in Sicyon (Poly. 18.16.1–2; Schwarzer 1999, 255–256); Attalos I as *synnaos* of a hero on Aegina (IG II², 885; cf. Schmidt-Dounas 1993–1994, 78–79).

60 Wörrle 2000; Wörrle 2007; cf. also Bielfeldt 2010 on the intensification in the late second century BCE.

61 Hepding 1907, 257–272 no. 8 a II 1. 62–63.



Fig. 8 Foot fragments of the armored statues (?) from hall H, with traces of repair.



Fig. 9 Foot fragments of the armored statues (?) from hall H, with traces of repair.

the marble fragments, which can be classified according to the find location, material, and format of the Attalids gallery in hall H, has provided further evidence of this. Indeed, traces of repairs can be found on fragments of bare feet of the statues from this find context (Figs. 8–9):⁶²

Attachment surfaces in the toes of the statues and holes for metal pins show that their tips have been inserted; sanding marks and scoring lines indicate manipulative interventions at this point and also contradict the idea to identify them as primary attachments as early as the sculptural fabrication stage, which were so common in the marble workshops of Pergamon.⁶³ Unfortunately, these repairs cannot be dated. It is tempting nonetheless to link them to the actions by Diodoros.⁶⁴ The same goes for the reworking of the king's head in Berlin (the presumed Attalos I) that likewise belongs to this group of statues.⁶⁵ The wreath of hair on this statue originates from a second phase of work, but we cannot date its production either. But since the head was reproduced with this new hairstyle on the early imperial sarcophagus of the *'tomba bella'* in Hierapolis, and the tresses

are largely identical,⁶⁶ the reworking of the head must have happened before the formation of the sarcophagus midway through the first century CE – whether this happened indeed in Diodoros' era remains unclear.⁶⁷ It is not even certain that the reworking was part of a repair; it could also have been done without external reason for the purpose of updating the iconography of the royal statue, perhaps as part of a lingering cult. At any rate, the new hairstyle gave the representation a divine pull – but it does not approximate the depicted king to Alexander and does not show an *anastole* at all. The new hair does not refer to a concrete deification, but visually approximates the image to those of male gods, which, like Alexander himself, were depicted with such a wreath of hair.⁶⁸ It also demonstrates the continuous care for the royal likenesses in hall H, as does the preservation of the statues.

Not all of the Attalid likenesses survived for long in the gymnasium. The base of the bronze statue presumably dedicated to Attalos I (Fig. 5) was probably reused in the early first century BCE for the erection of another bronze statue and the attachment of an honorific inscription.

⁶² The fragments were found in 1906 in the same wall where the fragments of the aforementioned armored statues were found: feet with legs and marble plinth, Bergama, Depot der Pergamongrabung/Untere Agora: von den Hoff 2015a, 128 with note 42 fig. 15. Left foot on marble plinth, Bergama, Depot der Pergamongrabung no. S 284; unpublished.

⁶³ On attachments in Pergamene sculpture see Hoffer 2011; Hoffer 2015.

⁶⁴ Following von den Hoff 2004, 388; von den Hoff 2015a, 129 with note 51.

⁶⁵ von den Hoff 2013b with further literature; Scholl 2016, 52–54 no. 36 (R.

von den Hoff and C. Blume).

⁶⁶ Cf. recently Romeo, Panariti, and Ungaro 2014, 220–222 and Smith 2015, 809.

⁶⁷ Then Diodoros in fact would have commissioned repairs not only of the statues of Philetairos and Attalos III, to which the head indeed cannot belong due to its physiognomy or date, but of others that may have been named in the aforementioned lacunae of the inscriptions.

⁶⁸ von den Hoff 2011, 128; von den Hoff 2013b.

tion.⁶⁹ The base of a bronze statue of Attalos III was likewise later turned upside down for the installation of another bronze statue, but was then – in a third use – ground down and used as part of a subsequent wall, which is where it was found.⁷⁰ Such destruction of statues and reuse of their base blocks is not uncommon.⁷¹ The marble portrait statues in hall H, the most prominent location of the upper gymnasium terrace, were evidently excluded from this process. Hall H and its environs were also a focal point for the installation of other portrait statues into the imperial era.⁷²

In the high imperial period – perhaps as early as the construction of the palaestra porticos of the upper terrace in marble, likely in the late Flavian era – the hall received a newly designed entrance and a new barrel vault ceiling suspended on pillars – a sign of the abiding significance of this space in the gymnasium.⁷³ The pillars were placed in front of the walls and columns of the north and south sides of the room, as well as to the right and left of the central niche (Figs. 1–2). In the process, the parts of the semicircular base of the niche that laterally extended to the wall surfaces had to be dismantled; some of the leftover fragments were used in the underpinnings of the new pillars. Stabilizing masonry arches were placed in front of the side walls of the niche as well; these reduced the clear span of the niche from 6.4 to 5 m (Fig. 1). The remaining part of the semicircular base now no longer could have four statues alongside Heracles, but one statue each to his left and right – in consideration of the space and the symmetry.

The context in which the remnants of only three statues were found in 1907 is further evidence that two

statues were actually removed at the time but that the three middle ones were preserved: not until the next construction phase of hall H, which should be assigned to the late third century CE at the earliest, did they find their way into a wall that closed off the lateral entrances of hall H but not its central one, so that the hall remained accessible and in use.⁷⁴ Although the remnants of the three statues found in the wall in 1907 had been broken to pieces, the heads were almost unscathed in the marble surface, with bits of hair still stuck to the head of the presumed Attalos I. They were therefore most likely to have been built into the wall just after their destruction, meaning they had been standing until then, while other fragments at the time probably found their way into lime kilns. Only then did the rest of the Attalid group with Heracles disappear from hall H.

Even though we can say so little with any certainty about the date of the end of the ruler cult in the gymnasium after the end of the Attalid monarchy and how statues were included in it,⁷⁵ It appears that, in the central hall H, where Eumenes II may have initiated the cult around Philetairos, portrait statues of Pergamon's kings in full military dress were preserved in colossal format as visual *synnaoi theoi* of their mythical ancestor Heracles until at least the third century CE – more than four hundred years, as Eumenes II had donated them in the first half of the second century BCE. Even when Roman emperors retained a cult in the gymnasium,⁷⁶ the imperial likenesses never replaced the portraits of the Attalid kings. Instead, the new rulers received other, more second-tier places in the gymnasium.⁷⁷

69 Hepding 1907, 320 no. 48 b; Mathys 2014, 50; fig. 10; 138 Gy U8: “dreimal verwendet”.

70 Hepding 1907, 311 no. 33; <http://inscriptions.packhum.org/text/316622> (visited on 17/10/2018).

71 Cf., e.g., von den Hoff, Mathys, and Stappmanns 2011, 276–277.

72 Mathys 2014, 67–68; 93–94.

73 On these renovations see Schazmann 1923, 60–61 with fig. 22; Radt and Filgis 1986, 119 note 396; Trümper 2015, 194 with note 80; on the renovations in other rooms see Trümper 2015, 178.

74 For more on the find see Schazmann 1923, 61; Auinger 2015.

75 On the duration of the cult of Hellenistic kings see Chankowski 2010, for

Pergamon cf. Gauthier 1985, 48.

76 E.g., in room 57 of the middle terrace of the gymnasium: Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1904, 167–168 no. 8; Schazmann 1923, 37–38.

77 E.g., perhaps in the ‘imperial hall’ G adjacent to hall H: Schazmann 1923, 56–58; von den Hoff 2008, 106–108; Trümper 2015, 178 (“after A. D. 161”); 192 with note 73 (includes the proposition of a cultic function for this space). On the dating in the Flavian period (shortly after 90 CE) together with the halls of the palaestra, see Stročka 2012, 204–219, esp. 218–219. On the imperial portraits not far from hall H see also Mathys 2014, 67–68. On room 57 of the middle terrace see Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1904, 167–168 no. 8; Schazmann 1923, 37–38.

Bibliography

Ameling 2004

Walter Ameling. "Wohltäter im hellenistischen Gymnasion". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*. Ed. by P. Scholz and D. Kah. Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel 8. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 129–161.

Aneziri and Damaskos 2004

Sophia Aneziri and Dimitros Damaskos. "Städtische Kulte im hellenistischen Gymnasion". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*. Ed. by P. Scholz and D. Kah. Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel 8. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 247–241.

Auinger 2015

Johanna Auinger. "...zwei überlebensgrosse wohlerhaltene Köpfe..." aus dem Gymnasion von Pergamon – Zum Fundort des Herrscherporträts AvP VII 130 und des Herakleskopfes Sk 1675". In *Pergamon als Zentrum der hellenistischen Kunst. Bedeutung, Eigenheiten und Ausstrahlung*. Ed. by R. Grüßinger, U. Kästner, and A. Scholl. Berlin: Michael Imhof, 2015, 64–65.

Bachmann 2013

Martin Bachmann. "Das neue Restaurierungsprojekt im Gymnasion. Pergamon – Bericht über die Arbeiten in der Kampagne 2012, ed. by F. Pirson". *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (2013). Ed. by F. Pirson, 146–157.

Bachmann 2014

Martin Bachmann. "Arbeiten im Gymnasion 2013. Pergamon – Bericht über die Arbeiten in der Kampagne 2013, ed. by F. Pirson". *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (2014), 170–173.

Bachmann 2015

Martin Bachmann. "Restaurierungsarbeiten im Gymnasion. Pergamon – Bericht über die Arbeiten in der Kampagne 2014, ed. by F. Pirson". *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (2015), 168–174.

Bielfeldt 2010

Ruth Bielfeldt. "Wo nur sind die Bürger von Pergamon? Eine Phänomenologie bürgerlicher Unscheinbarkeit im städtischen Raum der Königsresidenz". *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 60 (2010), 117–201.

Buraselis and Aneziri 2004

Kostas Buraselis and Sophia Aneziri. "Die hellenistische Herrscherapotheose". In *Thesaurus cultus et rituum antiquorum* 2. Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2004, 172–186.

Chaniotis 2003

Angelos Chaniotis. "The Divinity of Hellenistic Rulers". In *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Ed. by Andrew Erskine. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003, 431–445.

Chankowski 1998

Andrzej S. Chankowski. "La procédure législative à Pergame au I^{er} siècle av. J.C. A propos de la chronologie relative des décrets en l'honneur de Diodoros Paspáros". *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 122 (1998), 159–199.

Chankowski 2010

Andrzej S. Chankowski. "Les cultes des souverains hellénistiques après la disparition des dynasties. Formes de survie et d'extinction d'une institution dans un context civique". In *Des rois au prince. Pratiques du pouvoir monarchique dans l'Orient hellénistique et romain (IV^e siècle avant J.-C. – II^e siècle après J.-C.)* Ed. by I. Savalli-Lestrade. Grenoble: ELLUG, 2010, 271–290.

Coppola 2016

Alessandra Coppola. "Kings, Gods and Heroes in a Dynastic Perspective. A Comparative Approach". *Erga* 4 (2016), 17–37.

Dekrete 1997

Helmut Müller. *Dekrete*. Unpubliziertes Manuskript. 1997.

Delorme 1960

Jean Delorme. *Gymnasion: Étude sur les monuments consacrés à l'éducation en Grèce (des origines à l'Empire Romain)*. Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 196. Paris: De Boccard, 1960.

Erskine 2014

Andrew Erskine. "Ruler Cult and the Early Hellenistic City". In *The Age of the Successors and the Creation of the Hellenistic Kingdoms (323 – 276 B.C.)* Ed. by Hans Hauben and Alexander Meeus. *Studia Hellenistica* 53. Leiden: Peeters, 2014, 579–597.

Fleischer 1991

Robert Fleischer. *Studien zur seleukidischen Kunst 1. Herrscherbildnisse*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1991.

Gauthier 1985

Philippe Gauthier. *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*. Bulletin de correspondance hellénique, Supplément 12. Paris: De Boccard, 1985.

Gauthier 2003

Philippe Gauthier. "De nouveaux honneurs culturels pour Philétaïros de Pergame. A propos de deux inscriptions récemment publiées". In *Studi ellenistici*. Ed. by B. Virgilio. 15. Pisa: Serra, 2003, 9–23.

Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993

Philippe Gauthier and Miltiades B. Hatzopoulos. *La loi gymnasiarchique de Beroia*. Paris: De Boccard, 1993.

Genovese 2011

Cristina Genovese. "Per eterna memoria e immortalità di un benefattore: L' 'Heroon' di Diodoro Paspáro a Pergamo". *Mediterraneo antico. Economia, società, cultura* 14 (2011), 57–74.

Grote 1992a

Ursula Grote. "Bauplastik aus Pergamon". In *Μουσικός ανηρ. Festschrift für Max Wegner zum 90. Geburtstag*. Bonn: Habelt, 1992, 179–187.

Grote 1992b

Ursula Grote. "Nike". In *Lexicon iconographicum mytjologiae classicae* 6. Zürich: Artemis, 1992, 850–904.

Grüßinger, Kästner, and Scholl 2011

Ralf Grüßinger, Volker Kästner, and Andreas Scholl, eds. *Pergamon. Panorama der antiken Metropole*. Petersberg: Michael Imhof, 2011.

Günther 2011

Linda-Marie Günther, ed. *Studien zum vorhellenistischen und hellenistischen Herrscherkult*. Oikumene 9. Berlin: Verlag Antike, 2011.

Habicht 1970

Christian Habicht. *Gottmenschen und griechische Städte*. Zetemata 14. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1970.

Hepding 1907

Hugo Hepding. "Die Inschriften". *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung* 32 (1907), 241–377.

Hepding 1910

Hugo Hepding. "Die Inschriften". *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung* 35 (1910), 401–493.

Herz 1996

Peter Herz. "Hellenistische Könige. Zwischen griechischen Vorstellungen vom Königtum und Vorstellungen ihrer einheimischen Untertanen". In *Subject and Ruler. The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity*. Ed. by A. Small. Supplement 17. Ann Arbor, MI: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1996.

von den Hoff 2004

Ralf von den Hoff. "Ornamenta γυμνασίου? Delos und Pergamon als Beispielfälle der Skulpturenausstattung hellenistischer Gymnasien". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*. Ed. by P. Scholz and D. Kah. *Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel* 8. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 373–405.

von den Hoff 2008

Ralf von den Hoff. "Gymnasium. Pergamon – Bericht über die Arbeiten in der Kampagne 2007". *Archäologischer Anzeiger*. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (2008), 106–110.

von den Hoff 2011

Ralf von den Hoff. "Bildnisse der Attaliden". In *Pergamon. Panorama der antiken Metropole*. Ed. by R. Grüßinger, V. Kästner, and A. Scholl. Petersberg: Michael Imhof, 2011, 122–130.

von den Hoff, Mathys, and Stappmanns 2011

Ralf von den Hoff, Marianne Mathys, and Verena Stappmanns. "Das Gymnasium – Architektur, Nutzung und Bildwerke". In *Pergamon. Panorama der antiken Metropole*. Ed. by Ralf Grüßinger, Volker Kästner, and Andreas Scholl. Petersberg: Michael Imhof, 2011, 270–277.

von den Hoff and Mathys 2011

Ralf von den Hoff and Marianne Mathys. "Statuen im Gymnasium: Vorbilder im städtischen Raum". In *Skulpturen in Pergamon: Gymnasium, Heiligtum, Palast*. Ed. by Ralf von den Hoff and Lars Petersen. Kettler: Bönen, 2011, 39–45.

von den Hoff 2013a

Ralf von den Hoff. "Kolossaler Kopf des Herakles". In *Gesamtkatalog der Skulpturen*. Ed. by Antikensammlung Berlin. Köln: online, 2013. URL: <http://arachne.uni-koeln.de/item/objekt/113704> (visited on 19/11/2018).

von den Hoff 2013b

Ralf von den Hoff. "Überlebensgroßer Porträtkopf Eumenes II. (sogenannter Attalos I.)". In *Gesamtkatalog der Skulpturen*. Ed. by Antikensammlung Berlin. Köln: online, 2013. URL: <http://arachne.uni-koeln.de/item/objekt/2145> (visited on 19/11/2018).

von den Hoff 2015a

Ralf von den Hoff. "Das Gymnasium von Pergamon. Herrscherlicher und bürgerlicher Raum in der hellenistischen Polis". In *Urbane Strukturen und bürgerliche Identität im Hellenismus*. Ed. by A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann. *Hellenistische Polis als Lebensform* 5. Heidelberg: Verlag Antike, 2015, 123–145.

von den Hoff 2015b

Ralf von den Hoff. "Die Clipei aus dem Mittelsaal H des Gymnasiums von Pergamon". In *Pergamon als Zentrum der hellenistischen Kunst. Bedeutung, Eigenheiten & Ausstrahlung*. Ed. by Ralf Grüßinger, Ursula Kästner, and Andreas Scholl. Petersberg: Michael Imhof, 2015, 55–63.

Hofter 2011

Mathias Rene Hofter. "Von Dübeln und Löchern – Antike Anstückungstechniken an pergamenischen Skulpturen". In *Pergamon: Panorama der antiken Metropole*. Ed. by R. Grüßinger, V. Kästner, and A. Scholl. Petersberg: Michael Imhof, 2011, 334–337.

Hofter 2015

Mathias Rene Hofter. "Technische Beobachtungen zu freistehenden Skulpturen der Altarterrasse von Pergamon". In *Pergamon als Zentrum der hellenistischen Kunst. Bedeutung, Eigenheiten und Ausstrahlung*. Ed. by R. Grüßinger, U. Kästner, and A. Scholl. Petersberg: Michael Imhof, 2015, 144–155.

Iossif 2011

Panagiotidis P. Iossif. *More than Men, less than Gods. Studies on Royal Cult and Imperial Worship*. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.

Jacobsthal 1908

Paul Jacobsthal. "Die Inschriften". *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung* 33 (1908), 375–420.

Jones 1974

Christopher P. Jones. "Diodoros Paspas and the Nikephoria of Pergamon". *Chiron* 4 (1974), 183–205.

Jones 2000

Christopher P. Jones. "Diodoros Paspas revisited". *Chiron* 30 (2000), 1–14.

Kotsidou 2000

Haritini Kotsidou. *TIME KAI DOXA. Ehrungen für hellenistische Herrscher im griechischen Mutterland und in Kleinasien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der archäologischen Denkmäler*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2000.

Laube 2006

Ingrid Laube. *Thorakophoroi. Gestalt und Semantik des Brustpanzers in der Darstellung des 4. bis 1. Jhs. v. Chr.* Tübinger archäologische Forschungen 1. Rahden/Westf.: Marie Leidorf, 2006.

Mathys 2014

Marianne Mathys. *Architekturstiftungen und Ehrenstatuen. Untersuchungen zur visuellen Repräsentation der Oberschicht im späthellenistischen und kaiserzeitlichen Pergamon*. Pergamenische Forschungen 16. Darmstadt: Philipp von Zabern, 2014.

Meier 2012

Ludwig Meier. *Die Finanzierung öffentlicher Bauten in der hellenistischen Polis*. Hellenistische Polis als Lebensform 3. Heidelberg: Verlag Antike, 2012.

Michels 2011

Christoph Michels. "Dionysos Kathegemon und der attalidische Herrscherkult. Überlegungen zur Herrschaftsrepräsentation der Könige von Pergamon". In *Studien zum vorhellenistischen und hellenistischen Herrscherkult*. Ed. by L.-M. Günther and S. Plischke. Berlin: Verlag Antike, 2011, 114–140.

Müller 1992

Helmut Müller. "Phryomachos im pergamenischen Nikephorion?" *Chiron* 22 (1992), 195–226.

Müller 1997b

Helmut Müller. "Ehreninschriften, Weihinschriften (Manuskript)". 1997.

Müller 2000

Helmut Müller. "Der hellenistische Archiereus". *Chiron* 30 (2000), 519–542.

Müller 2003

Helmut Müller. "Pergamenische Parerga". *Chiron* 33 (2003), 419–445.

Picón and Hemingway 2016

Carlos A. Picón and Seán Hemingway, eds. *Pergamon and the Hellenistic Kingdoms of the Ancient World*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2016.

Pirson 2011a

Felix Pirson. "Pergamon – Bericht über die Arbeiten in der Kampagne 2010". *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (2011), 81–212.

Pirson 2011b

Felix Pirson. "Stadtraum und Städtebau im hellenistischen Pergamon". In *Pergamon. Panorama der antiken Metropole*. Ed. by Ralf Grüßinger, Volker Kästner, and Andreas Scholl. Petersberg: Michael Imhof, 2011, 66–73.

Platz-Horster 2013

Gertrud Platz-Horster. "Herakles in Brabant. Die Amethyst-Gemme aus Sint-Oedenrode". *Babesch. Annual Papers on Classical Archaeology* 88 (2013), 191–203.

Price 1984

Simon R. F. Price. *Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Queyrel 2003

Francois Queyrel. *Les portraits des Attalides. Fonction et représentation*. Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 308. Athens: De Boccard, 2003.

Queyrel 2015

Francois Queyrel. "Synnaoi theoi. Die sakrale Inszenierung der Königsstatuen". In *Das Charisma des Herrschers*. Ed. by D. Boschung and J. Hammerstaedt. Paderborn: Fink, 2015, 213–233.

Radt 2011

Wolfgang Radt. *Pergamon. Geschichte und Bauten einer antiken Metropole*. Darmstadt: WGB, 2011.

Radt and Filgis 1986

Wolfgang Radt and Meinrad N. Filgis. *Die Stadtgrabung 1. Das Heroon*. Altertümer von Pergamon 15.1. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986.

Rheidt 1996

Klaus Rheidt. "Pergamenische Ordnungen. Der Zeustempel und seine Bedeutung für die Architektur der Attaliden". In *Säule und Gebälk. Zu Struktur und Wandlungsprozess griechisch-römischer Architektur*. Ed. by E. L. Schwandner. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1996, 162–180.

Romeo, Panariti, and Ungaro 2014

Ilaria Romeo, Dario Panariti, and Rosangela Ungaro. *La tomba bella. Un heroon giulio-claudio e il suo sarcofago*. Hierapolis di Frigia 6. Istanbul: Ege Yayınları, 2014.

Schazmann 1923

Paul Schazmann. *Das Gymnasion. Der Tempelbezirk der Hera Basilea*. Altertümer von Pergamon 6. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1923.

Scheer 1993

Tanja Susanne Scheer. *Mythische Vorväter. Zur Bedeutung griechischer Heroenmythen im Selbstverständnis kleinasiatischer Städte*. Münchener Arbeiten zur alten Geschichte 7. Munich: Maris, 1993.

Schmidt-Dounas 1993–1994

Barbara Schmidt-Dounas. "Statuen hellenistischer Könige als Synnaoi Theoi". *Egnatia* (1993–1994), 71–141.

Schober 1951

Arnold Schober. *Die Kunst von Pergamon*. Vienna: M. F. Rohrer, 1951.

Scholl 2016

Andreas Scholl, ed. *Griechische und römische Bildnisse*. Katalog der Skulpturen in der Antikensammlung der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin 1. Petersberg: Michael Imhof, 2016.

Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1904

Bruno Schröder, Hans Schrader, and Walther Kolbe. "Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon 1902–1903. Die Inschriften". *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung* 29 (1904), 152–178.

Schwarzer 1999

Holger Schwarzer. "Untersuchungen zum hellenistischen Herrscherkult in Pergamon". *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 49 (1999), 249–300.

Schwarzer 2011

Holger Schwarzer. "Der Herrscherkult der Attaliden". In *Pergamon. Panorama der antiken Metropole*. Ed. by R. Grüßinger, V. Kästner, and A. Scholl. Petersberg: Michael Imhof, 2011, 110–117.

Smith 2015

Robert R. R. Smith. "Citizens and Kings in the Tomba Bella at Hierapolis". *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 28 (2015), 803–810.

Stappmanns 2011

Verena Stappmanns. "Das Gymnasion von Pergamon: Architektur und Nutzungsgeschichte". In *Skulpturen in Pergamon: Gymnasion, Heiligtum, Palast*. Ed. by L. Petersen and R. von den Hoff. Bönen: Kettler, 2011.

Stappmanns 2012

Verena Stappmanns. "...das Mögliche wirklich werden lassen... Zu Standort, Entwurf und Konstruktion des hellenistischen Gymnasions von Pergamon". In *Manifestationen von Macht und Hierarchien in Stadtraum und Landschaft*. Ed. by F. Pirson. Byzas 13. Istanbul: Ege Yayınları, 2012, 233–250.

Stappmanns 2014

Verena Stappmanns. "Das Gymnasion von Pergamon: Erschließungswege als Schlüssel funktionaler Gliederung". In *Die Architektur des Weges: Gestaltete Bewegung im gebauten Raum. Internationales Kolloquium in Berlin vom 8.–11. Februar 2012, veranstaltet vom Architekturreferat des DAI*. Ed. by D. Kurapkat, P. I. Schneider, and U. Wulf-Rheidt. Diskussionen zur archäologischen Bauforschung 11. Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner, 2014, 121–132.

Stappmanns 2015

Verena Stappmanns. "Das hellenistische Gymnasion von Pergamon – Neue Forschungen zur Bau- und Nutzungsgeschichte". In *Bericht über die 48. Tagung für Ausgrabungswissenschaft und Bauforschung: vom 28. Mai bis 1. Juni 2014 in Erfurt*. Ed. by M. Bachmann, U. Wulf-Rheidt, H. Bankel, and A. Schwarting. Stuttgart: Koldewey-Gesellschaft, 2015, 172–179.

Strocka 2012

Volker Michael Strocka. "Bauphasen des kaiserzeitlichen Asklepieions von Pergamon". *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 62 (2012), 199–287.

Trombetti 2013

Catia Trombetti. *Il ginnasio greco. Genesi, topografia e culti dei luoghi della paideia*. BAR International Series 2527. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2013.

Trümper 2015

Monika Trümper. "Modernization and Change of Function of Hellenistic Gymnasia in the Imperial Period: Case-studies Pergamon, Miletus, and Priene". In *Das kaiserzeitliche Gymnasion*. Ed. by P. Scholz and D. Wiegandt. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015, 167–221.

Virgilio 1993

Biagio Virgilio. *Gli Attalidi di Pergamo. Fama, eredità, memoria*. Studi ellenistici 5. Pisa: Giardini, 1993.

von den Hoff and Petersen 2011

Ralf von den Hoff and Lars Petersen, eds. *Skulpturen in Pergamon: Gymnasion, Heiligtum, Palast*. Bönen: Kettler, 2011.

Walbank 1987

Frank William Walbank. "Könige als Götter. Überlegungen zum Herrscherkult von Alexander bis Augustus". *Chiron* 17 (1987), 365–382.

Wörle 2000

Michael Wörle. "Pergamon um 133 v. Chr." *Chiron* 30 (2000), 543–576.

Wörle 2007

Michael Wörle. "Zu Rang und Bedeutung von Gymnasion und Gymnasiarchie im hellenistischen Pergamon". *Chiron* 37 (2007), 501–516.

Illustration credits

1 Building documentation/drawing: Verena Stappmanns.
2 Photo: D-DAI-ATH-Pergamon-1341. 3 Photo: D-DAI-ATH-Pergamon-0428. 4 Photo: Ralf von den Hoff. 5 Photo: Ralf von den Hoff. 6 Photo: D-DAI-ATH-Pergamon-1389.
7 Photo: D-DAI-ATH-Pergamon-1761. 8 Photo: Ralf von den Hoff. 9 Photo: Ralf von den Hoff.

RALF VON DEN HOFF

Dr. phil. (Bonn 1992), Habilitation (Munich 2000), researcher and instructor as Professor of Classical Archeology at the University of Freiburg. He is the spokesperson of the DFG Special Research Area 948, *Heroes – Heroizations – Heroisms*, and works primarily on issues of ancient pictorial culture and on Greek and Roman portrait representation, as well as on the imagery of the heroic in antiquity.

Prof. Dr. Ralf von den Hoff
Universität Freiburg
Abteilung Klassische Archäologie
Fahnenbergplatz
79085 Freiburg i. Br., Germany
E-Mail: vd.hoff@archaeologie.uni-freiburg.de

Daniel Kah

The Gymnasiarchia from the Hellenistic Age to the Roman Empire: the Example of Rhodes

Summary

Several *gymnasiarchiai* are testified for Hellenistic and Roman Imperial Rhodes: a *gymnasiarchos* of the *presbyteroi*, another of the *neoteroi*, and a tribal office connected to torch races. Within the predominantly epigraphic sources, the most revealing are Hellenistic CV inscriptions, a unique feature of Rhodian epigraphic habit. They enable us to place offices chronologically within the sequel of individuals' public functions, showing that each *gymnasiarchia* was held at a certain age. Comparing Hellenistic and Roman Imperial inscriptions reveals a remarkable continuity in the representation of the Rhodian *gymnasiarchiai*, the single major divergence being a pronounced emphasis on the distribution of oil in the Imperial age.

Keywords: *Gymnasiarchia*, Rhodes, Hellenistic Age, Roman Imperial Age; Greek inscriptions/Greek epigraphy; CV inscriptions

Für das hellenistische und kaiserzeitliche Rhodos sind verschiedene Gymnasiarchien bezeugt: ein *gymnasiarchos* der *presbyteroi*, einer der *neoteroi* und ein Phylenamt, das mit Fackelläu-

fen verbunden war. Innerhalb der vorwiegend epigraphischen Quellen sind hellenistische Lebenslaufinschriften, eine Besonderheit des rhodischen *epigraphic habit*, am aufschlussreichsten. Denn sie erlauben es, Ämter innerhalb der Abfolge öffentlicher Funktionen einzelner Individuen zeitlich zu verorten, und zeigen dabei, dass jede der Gymnasiarchien in einem bestimmten Alter ausgeübt wurde. Ein Vergleich hellenistischer und kaiserzeitlicher Inschriften zeigt eine bemerkenswerte Kontinuität in der Darstellung der rhodischen Gymnasiarchien, wobei die einzige bedeutende Abweichung darin besteht, dass in der Kaiserzeit Ölspenden stärker betont wurden.

Keywords: Gymnasiarchie; Rhodos; Hellenismus; Kaiserzeit; griechische Inschriften/griechische Epigraphik; Lebenslaufinschriften

I would like to thank Ulrich Mania and Monika Trümper for inviting me to the conference, Peter Scholz and Christian Fron for helpful comments on the paper, and Niall McCourt for his very professional assistance with my English. All remaining errors are, of course, my own.

From the Hellenistic age onwards, the *gymnasion* was not only one of the buildings a proper Greek *polis* could not do without, developing into an important public space called a “second agora” by Louis Robert. It was also one of the major institutions of a *polis*, organizing the military and intellectual education of the young citizens as well as the athletic activities of various age classes.¹ Given this status, control of the *gymnasion*, usually exercised by an official named *gymnasiarchos*, should have ranked among the top priorities of *polis* governments. Despite this, the *gymnasiarchia* has received comparatively little systematic attention: Following Jean Delorme’s seminal investigation into the *gymnasion*, which is focused on archaeological questions, the office is illuminated by some recent articles as well as Olivier Curty’s very useful collection of Hellenistic decrees honouring *gymnasiarchoi*.²

Due to the fact that especially in the epigraphic sources, *gymnasiarchoi* usually figure not so much as magistrates active in an administrative context but as public benefactors, spending parts of their private wealth to support the costly institution, the main focus of recent research into the office has been embedded in the discussion of how euergetism defined the interaction between the population of the *polis* and its elites. This article is a minor contribution towards a more balanced view of the relationship between magistracy and liturgy, based on a cluster of local evidence not analyzed in detail so far.

1 Magistracy and liturgy

Before looking into the Rhodian evidence, it is necessary to address the basic question of whether the *gymnasiarchia* is to be understood primarily as a magistracy

(*arche*) or as a liturgy (*leitourgia*). In his article on the Hellenistic *gymnasiarchia*, Christof Schuler has proposed that the *gymnasiarchia* was established as a proper magistracy in the second half of the fourth century, but that an earlier ‘liturgical model’ remained active throughout the Hellenistic period. On the relationship between *arche* and *leitourgia*, he cites Friedemann Quaß’ definition of the *gymnasiarchia* as a ‘liturgical magistracy’, meaning that while the *gymnasiarchia* was a public office of the *polis*, it also involved financial burdens imposed upon the magistrate.³ In contrast to Schuler, Olivier Curty sees the main distinction between types of the *gymnasiarchia* not in its liturgical aspects, but in the question of whether it was a magistracy of the *polis* or an internal function of the *gymnasion*.⁴ Focussing on the Hellenistic period, both Schuler and Curty adopt the widely accepted position that in the Roman Empire, the *gymnasiarchia* developed into a pure form of liturgy. As Louis Robert pointed out, parallel to the meaning of *gymnasia* in the Latin West, γυμνασιαρχεῖν could adopt the meaning of “to provide oil” in the Greek East also, and in some places the *gymnasiarchia* was one of the burdens that could be avoided by paying a *summa honoraria*.⁵

There is, however, one well-known problem with the evidence for financial expenses associated with office-holding in the Hellenistic and Imperial *poleis*: We usually cannot tell whether these expenses were demanded by law (which they should have been in the case of a proper liturgy) or were a result of voluntary munificence, in which case they should correctly be called *euergesia*. In everyday life, the difference between these two options was probably of no great import, since members of the elites may have been more swayed by the expectations of the citizenry and their peer group than by legal

1 For recent overviews on the *gymnasion*, see Kah and Scholz 2004 and Scholz and Wiegandt 2015. ‘Seconde agora’: Robert 1960, 298 n. 3 (Robert 1969, 814 n. 3); cf. Robert 1966b, 422 (Robert 1989, 46; Robert 2007, 638: “une autre agora”); Gauthier 1995, 10 (Gauthier 2010, 549; Gauthier 2011, 101); recent critical reappraisals of Robert’s term: Sielhorst 2015, 178; Scholz 2017, 21–22.

2 Delorme 1960 (with numerous mentions of *gymnasiarchoi* [see the index p. 530] but no systematic study of the *gymnasiarchia*; cf. the discussion in Curty 2015, 338–342). On the Hellenistic *gymnasiarchia*, see Quaß 1993, 286–291, Schuler 2004, the articles in Curty, Piccand, and Codouey 2009 and of course the commentary on the gymnasiarchal law of Beroia (Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993; SEG 43, 381; EKM I 1); cf. Wörrle 2007 on Pergamon and van Nijf 2013, 317–319. See also Cordiano 1997 on the *gymnasiarchia* in the Greek West; Vitale 2014 on *gymnasiarchoi* with multiple *gymnasia*; Quaß 1993, 317–323 and Scholz 2015 on the *gymnasiarchia* in the Imperial age. Collection of decrees: Curty 2015.

3 Schuler 2004, 171–172 and 189; Quaß 1993, 298–299 (“leiturgisch belastete ‘Ämter’”).

4 Curty 2015, 282–291 and 344. Because the Rhodian evidence does not contribute to the discussion of this undoubtedly pertinent question, I will not address it in any detail. Cf. my criticism of Curty’s assumption that a decree for a *gymnasiarchos* enacted by an association of *gymnasion* users (e.g. *neoi*) indicates that the honorand was a functionary of this group and not of the *polis* (Kah 2017).

5 Robert 1939, 736 n. 2 (Robert 1969, 608 n. 2); Robert 1943, 192–194; BE 1953, 194; BE 1983, 84; cf. Delorme 1960, 301 (arguing that spontaneous acts of generosity developed into obligations over the long term); Schuler 2004, 189–191; Quaß 1993, 320; van Bremen 1996, 68–73; Curty 2009, 3; Curty 2015, 293–294; Scholz 2015, 83–86. For the meaning of Latin *gymnasia* cf. Fagan 1999 and Lafer 2013 (arguing that in the North African provinces, the term was used to designate athletic contest).

prescriptions. Then again, public functions in Hellenistic *poleis* could also be understood as *archai* and *leitourgiai* at the same time. A well-documented example for the *gymnasiarchia* is Priene: In a document announcing the sale of a priesthood (*diagraphē*) dated to the middle of the second century BC, the *gymnasiarchia* is named as one of the liturgies that the buyer could avoid by meeting a certain minimum offer in the auction. However, only several decades later the *gymnasiarchoi* appear among the officials the honorand of a decree had invited to an official banquet, and this same group is referred to as “the *synarchiai*” in two later decrees.⁶

As such, when looking at Greek magistrates one should keep in mind that many of them had to make expenses that would not be reimbursed by the *polis*. At the very least they were usually expected to work for free. And it is important to recall that with each *polis* making its own regulations there was no such thing as ‘Greek law’. Therefore, not only the designations and jurisdictions of specific institutions varied from city to city, but general concepts such as *leitourgia* and *arche* could also differ at least slightly. For fourth century Athens, a complex definition of a proper *arche* can be deduced from various sources, first among them the Aischines’ speech *Against Ctesiphon*, having among other provisions a minimum age of 30 for the office holder, a minimum term of office of three months and the accountability of the magistrate. But for most Hellenistic magistracies, there is no information as to whether these criteria were met. And there also is only scant evidence of how a Hellenistic *polis* defined a *leitourgia*. The exemptions offered in the aforementioned *diagraphē* from Priene and in numerous other examples, especially from Kos, clearly indicate that

the appointment to a *leitourgia* was compulsory. But in a Prienian decree from the first century BC, the honorand is praised for accepting the office of *grammateus*, undoubtedly a magistracy, after others had refused it “due to the burden of the *leitourgia*”. So in this case the *polis* could not appoint a citizen to the magistracy against his will, but once someone had accepted it voluntarily, he was expected to exhibit a considerable financial commitment.⁷

2 The Rhodian *gymnasiarchiai*

Rhodes may be regarded as a problematic example for an investigation of the social evolution of the Greek *polis* from Hellenism to the Roman Empire, since, in a number of aspects, it was hardly typical: It was unusually big, prosperous and powerful and, most importantly, it managed to combine a democratic constitution with a strong aristocratic elite throughout the Hellenistic age. So, while there are indications of an evolution towards a smaller, more concentrated aristocracy in the Early Empire, it is difficult to detect the process of aristocratisation proposed by Philippe Gauthier and his pupils for the Hellenistic *poleis* in general.⁸

What makes Rhodes interesting in the context of the *gymnasiarchia* is a unique epigraphic habit that allows the hierarchy of public offices to be much better reconstructed than in other *poleis*. Usually, the fact that a citizen had held a magistracy is documented by statue bases naming the honorand as an office holder, offerings with the dedicant bearing the respective title, or honorific decrees that praise a citizen for having performed excel-

6 Generally on the relationship between magistracies and liturgies: Quaß 1993, 298–303 and 343–346. The ambiguity is reflected by the fact that in the Imperial age, the *gymnasiarchia* is regarded as a *munus* in Latin legal sources but as an *arche* in inscriptions (van Bremen 1996, 68–70). For the evidence from Priene: I. Priene² 145 (I. Priene 174), l. 24–27: ἐὰν δὲ ὑπὲρ ἑξακισχίλιας δραχμῶς | εὖρη ἡ ἱερωσύνη, καὶ ἀτελὴς ἔσται ὁ πριάμενος | λαμπαδαρχίας ἀγωνοθεσίας ἵπποτροφίας | ἀρχιθεωρίας γυμνασιαρχίας. I. Priene² 67 (I. Priene 111; cf. Kah 2014, 167), l. 190–193: τοῦς δὲ ±7 | οὓς ἄ[ρχοντας] εἰς τὴν α[ὐτοῦ] οἰκίαν ἐκάλεσε πάντας· | τοὺς ἐπιμη[νίους] τῶν [στ]ρατη[γ]ῶν καὶ τὸν γυμ[ν]ασί[α]ρχον τῶν νέων [κ]αὶ τὸν | νεωποῖην (οἱ οἰκονόμον) καὶ τὸν γραμμ[α]τέα τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ [δ]η[μ]οῦ καὶ τὸν ἀντιγραφέα καὶ τὸν γυμνασίαρχον τῶν | γερόντων (?) καὶ τοὺς παιδονόμους καὶ τὸν ἀναγνώστην καὶ τὸν κήρυκα τῆς πόλεως. Cf. I. Priene² 69 (I. Priene 113), l. 83–84: τοὺς δὲ β[ο]υλευτάς καὶ τὰς συναρχί[α]ς καὶ ἐδεῖπνισεν ἐν τῷ [τ]οῦ θεοῦ τόπῳ and I. Priene² 70 (I. Priene 114), l. 26–27: τὴν δὲ β[ο]υλὴν καὶ τὰς | [συνα]ρχίας δις κατακλείνας ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἀναλωμάτων.

7 Athens: Hansen 1980, 152–154 (discussing Aeschin. 3.14–16 and 29) and 167–169 (for the age limit). A minimum age of 30 for a Hellenistic *gymnasiarchos* can be found in a law of Koresia on Keos from the early third century BC, regulating a festival (IG XII, 5, 647; LGS 94; SIG³ III, 958; LSCG 98, l. 21–22). For exemptions from liturgies in Priene see above, for Kos (where, curiously, the *gymnasiarchia* is never mentioned among the liturgies listed specifically) cf. Wiemer 2003, 289–290. The magistracy left vacant διὰ τὸ τῆς λειτουργίας βάρος is attested in I. Priene² 68 (I. Priene 112), l. 20–22.

8 I will use ‘Rhodes’ to refer to the island and the *polis* in general, and ‘Rhodos’ for the city situated on the northern tip of the island. For the Rhodian constitution, see O’Neill 1981; Gabrielsen 1997; Grieb 2008, 263–354 (who, using a rather restrictive definition of the term, denies the existence of a Rhodian aristocracy: 316–320). For the thesis of an aristocratisation, see Gauthier 1985, 73–75; Fröhlich 2004, 532–537; Hamon 2005; Hamon 2007.

lently in a specific magistracy.⁹ From Rhodes, there is only a very small number of extant decrees, and of these hardly any are honorific.¹⁰ What we have instead is a considerable number of inscriptions, mostly on statue bases, recording the public *curriculum vitae* of the honorand. These inscriptions, which are typologically similar to the Roman Imperial *cursus* inscriptions, are first attested in the second century BC and continue into the Roman Empire. They list civic offices, military activities, priesthoods and other religious functions a citizen had performed, and they also name honours he (or occasionally she) had received from various corporate entities such as associations and foreign polities. These lists can be quite short or rather long, and they apply to adults of all ages. In the late first century BC, honours gain predominance over offices, the latter being sometimes completely omitted from the Early Empire onwards. Most of these CVs seem to be ordered chronologically, and only some thematically.¹¹

In these CVs and other epigraphic evidence from Rhodes, three kinds of *gymnasiarchoi* are mentioned: a *gymnasiarchos* of the older men (*presbyteroi*), one of the younger men (*neoteroi*), and a tribal *gymnasiarchos* (γυμνασίαρχος φυλάς).¹² I will examine the status of these offices and how they were connected to partitions of the *polis*, starting with the two *gymnasiarchoi* distinguished as *presbyteros* and *neoterios* respectively. They can be identified with the *gymnasiarchoi* named in the plural in some other Rhodian inscriptions: two in a dedication (13),¹³

and an unspecified number in a catalogue of the board of leading magistrates (*synarchontes*) (9) and in the still largely unpublished collection of decrees concerning the Rhodian library (5). When named separately, both offices are usually denominated either with an adjective (e.g. γυμνασίαρχος πρεσβύτερος) or with a noun in the genitive plural (e.g. γυμνασίαρχος πρεσβυτέρων), the two forms each office's designation being assumed to be synonymous.¹⁴

As is evident from their appearance among the *synarchontes* and the decrees regulating the library, these *gymnasiarchoi* were proper magistrates of the *polis*.¹⁵ As the title *gymnasiarchos* is occasionally qualified by the addition of the name of a festival (κατὰ μέγαρα Ἀλίου or κατὰ Ῥωμαῖα), the *gymnasiarchoi* are sometimes assumed to have been involved with the organisation of these festivals, adding a special liturgical aspect to the office. But this kind of connection is only attested twice for *gymnasiarchoi*, whereas the qualification κατὰ (μέγαρα) Ἀλίου is attested for a number of other offices, including military functionaries like *strategoi* and *hegemones* for whom it is difficult to see how they could have been directly involved with a festival, especially on a regular basis. So while holding an office in a year when the pentaeteric Halieia (for the Rhomaia cf. Appendix II) were celebrated obviously generally carried some kind of distinction, there is no special connection to the *gymnasiarchia*.¹⁶

9 There are some late Hellenistic decrees for lifetime achievements, but these usually emphasize the last offices held by the honorand, as these were normally the most prestigious. For instance, the extraordinary long decrees on the western wall of the *hiera stoa* in Priene mention surprisingly few offices held by their respective honorands (cf. Kah 2014, 158).

10 Cf. IG XII, 1, 890 (Lindos, ca. 161 AD; cf. Badoud 2015, 164–165 no. A 4); IG XII, 1, 2 (53 AD); 31 (second century AD).

11 For this type of document that still has to be researched in detail cf. Kah 2016, 254 with n. 6.

12 The Rhodian *gymnasiarchiai* have been investigated rather cursorily: van Gelder 1900, 259; Cordiano 1997, 137–138; Schuler 2004, 166; Chankowski 2010, 199–200; Badoud 2015, 120–121. For public education in Rhodes in general cf. Bringmann 2002 and Drelisli-Iraklidou 2014. – A note on Greek terms: Rhodian inscriptions are usually written in the Dorian dialect used on the island. Since simply transcribing these dialect forms might lead to confusion (for example *phyla*, *boula*, *hagemon*), I either use the standard Greek equivalents in the transcriptions (*boule*, *hegemon*) or I cite the Greek form (for instance ἀγεμών). I also do not transcribe inflected Greek words or phrases (such as πρεσβυτέρων and κατὰ μέγαρα Ἀλίου). However, I retain the dialect forms in the transcriptions of names (e.g. Damagoras, Athana Lindia and Halieia).

13 Numbers in bold type refer to the catalogue of epigraphic testimonia in

Appendix I.

14 Hiller von Gaertringen 1894, 30; van Gelder 1900, 259; Maiuri 1925, 36; Chankowski 2010, 200. For the evidence see 11, l. 2, 10, l. 11 and 18, l. 8 (πρεσβύτερος); 10, l. 6, 19, l. 14 and 26 (νεώτερος); 8, l. 3 (πρεσβυτέρων); 12, l. 7, 17, l. 5, 20, l. 9 and 21, l. 6 (νεωτέρων).

15 Contra Chankowski 2010, 200 (“Le deux gymnasiarques semblent ne pas être les ‘chefs’ du gymnase ... mais assumer leur charge ... uniquement pour préparer un groupe des jeunes à la participation aux fêtes”), combining two erroneous interpretations: of the character of the age groups, and of the meaning of the addition of a festival to the title (cf. below).

16 *Gymnasiarchoi* of the *polis*: 11, l. 2: γυμ[να]σίαρχον πρεσβύτερον κατὰ Ῥωμαῖα and 13, l. 3–4: γυμνασίαρχησαντες κατὰ μέγαρα Ἀλίου. There is also one attestation for a tribal *gymnasiarchos* (7, l. 15: γυμνασίαρχησαντα φυλά κατὰ Ἀλίου μέγαρα). Cf. an inscription from the second century AD, where the honorand's activities are listed separately as *gymnasiarchos*, *agonothetes* of the Halieia, and priest of Halios: 24, l. 5–6. Rhodian *gymnasiarchoi* involved in the organisation of festivals: Maiuri 1925, 47; Cordiano 1997, 138; Chankowski 2010, 200; Drelisli-Iraklidou 2014, 44 with n. 53. Other offices linked to the Halieia: *strategos*: Segre and Pugliese Carratelli 1949–1951, 215 no. 75; *tamias*: Jacopi 1932b, 188–190, no 18, l. 16; SEG 39, 759 (Kontorini 1989a, 164–167, no. 73; Badoud

Apart from one fragment from Megiste (28) and one from Loryma (3), epigraphic evidence for Rhodian *gymnasiarchoi* is confined to the island itself.¹⁷ The earliest clear evidence for the two *gymnasiarchoi* of the *polis* is 5 from the second century BC. But the magistracies should predate this since the tribal *gymnasiarchoi* are documented in the early third century BC (1), and the two *gymnasiarchoi* of the *polis* can feasibly be restored in a fragmentary dedication dated to the first half of the third century (2).

The architecture of the Rhodian *gymnasion* is not documented very well. Archaeological research has identified a building on the eastern slope of the acropolis below the temple of Apollon as a large *gymnasion*, but – as far as I know – apart from the big stadium, not much of the complex has been excavated to date. Several dedications of ἐπιστάται τῶν παίδων from a large peristyle building in the south-eastern part of the lower city indicate that it served as a *palaistra* for boys. Since the literary sources persistently speak of only one *gymnasion* in Rhodes, it is likely that only the building on the acropolis slope was called by that name in antiquity.¹⁸

Leaving the exact definition of the age groups aside for later inspection, I will begin not with one of the CVs mentioned, but with an equally extraordinary mon-

ument that strikingly illuminates the status of a Rhodian *gymnasiarchos* under the Roman Empire (26): In the late second century AD, the town of Lindos, one of the island's three original cities that had formed the new *polis* of Rhodes in 408 BC, honored Publius Aelius Kallistratos, also called Plancianus – the “eternal, most ambitious eponymous *gymnasiarchos neoterus* in the great *polis* of Rhodos” – by erecting a group of no less than eight statues of him and some members of his family: his grandfathers, his wife, his mother, his father, his uncle and his fraternal grandmother. On the base of each statue, his *gymnasiarchia* is described as being perpetual (δι' αἰῶνος) as well as eponymous. But the *gymnasiarchos* himself is not the most prominent figure on the monument: That place is held jointly by his uncle (26 e) and grandmother (26 g), who had promised the foundation to the *polis* of Rhodes and other benefactions to the Lindians. So, at first glance, these inscriptions conform closely to what is expected of a ‘liturgical’ *gymnasiarchos* in the Imperial age, the emphasis being on the provision of funds for the *gymnasion*, for which the magistrate in this case – obviously being rather young, with three grandparents still alive – did not even provide the money himself.¹⁹

An ‘eternal’ *gymnasiarchia*, meaning that there was

2015, 405–406, no. 34), l. 5; 8, l. 1; *hegemon amisthos*: IG XII, 3, 7, l. 5–6 (cf. below, n.23); *epistates*: I. Lindos I, 264, l. 18–19 (uncertain restoration). In Jacopi 1932b, 210–211, no. 48, l. 4 ([– – –]σας ἐν τῷ ἄστει κατὰ μέγαν Ἀλῆϊαν), the *gymnasiarchia* cannot be restored since the specification ἐν τῷ ἄστει is not attested in connection with this office, being obviously redundant. Cf. also a CV mentioning several priesthoods apparently held during years with festivals (Kontorini 1983, 43–53 no. 3; SEG 33, Badoud 2015, 407–409 no. 36), l. 1–5 (for the syntactic oddities of this inscription cf. Kontorini 1983, 47–48 and Ma 2013, 50–51).

17 Cf. Appendix IV for a local *gymnasiarchia* on Nisyros. Two dedications of *gymnasiarchoi* from Mobolla (Muğla), which was part of the Rhodian possessions in Caria, refer to local magistrates since they also mention an *ephebarchos*, an office not attested on Rhodes (cf. Chankowski 2010, 203–204): Bresson, Brun, and Varinlioglu 2001, 190–191 no. 64 (Blümel 1991, 175 no. 783): Νικόλαος Λέοντος | Ῥόδιος | ἐφηβάρχης καὶ | γυμνασιαρχίας | Ἑρμῆ καὶ Ἡρακλεῖ | καὶ Ταρμιαῶν | τῷ κοινῷ and Bresson, Brun, and Varinlioglu 2001, 191–192 no. 65 (Blümel 1991, 175–176 no. 784): [– – –]λῆς Λέοντος | Κ[ε]νε[δ]ω[λ]αβ[ε]ὺς γυμνασιαρχίας καὶ Ἀντίπατρος Ἑκαταίου | Κε[ν]ε[δ]ω[λ]αβ[ε]ὺς ἐφηβάρχης | Ἡλῖω καὶ Ἑρμῆ καὶ Ἡρακ[λ]εῖ καὶ Ταρμιαῶν τῷ | κοινῷ (for the texts cf. Chankowski 2010, 445–446, no. 10–11). The restoration [– – –]τις Δαμοφειδ[ε]ὺς | [γυμνασιαρχ]ίας Ἡρακλεῖ proposed by Robert 1937, 79 in a fragmentary dedication from Phoinix (Blümel 1991, 45–46 no. 141; Bresson 1991, 152 no. 158; cf. Chankowski 2010, 445 no. 8) is not sufficiently justified by the fact that the recipient is Herakles (cf. Bresson's commentary).

18 For the big complex below the acropolis see Laurenzi 1938, 25–26 and 146; pl. XVI and Kondis 1952, 563–571; cf. Delorme 1960, 121–122; Fil-

imonos 1989, 129–132; Hoepfner 2002, 68–72 (with a very hypothetical reconstruction, especially of the library); Chankowski 2010, 204–206. Filimonos 1989, 152–153, identifies the peristyle with the Ptolemaion mentioned in Diod. 20.100.4 (συγκατατιθεμένου δὲ τοῦ χρηστηρίου τέμενος ἀνήκαν ἐν τῇ πόλει τετράγωνον, οἰκοδομήσαντες παρ' ἐκάστην πλευρὰν στοὰν σταδιαίαν, ὃ προσηγόρευσαν Πτολεμαίων), a building she interprets as a *gymnasion*. For the offerings see Kontorini 1989b (SEG 39, 771–776), who is sceptical of the proposed identification (Kontorini 1989b, 169–177). Cf. Chankowski 2010, 204–205 and Drelis-Iraklidou 2014, 42–43. For the literary sources see Kontorini 1989b, 171–172 (cf. Chankowski 2010, 204). There is actually only one extant Rhodian inscription using the term γυμνάσιον (31); it is plausibly restored in 29, l. 2 (cf. also 30, where the restoration is unclear). Groups of users employing the word in their designation are not attested on Rhodes: A statue base erected by οἱ ἀπὸ γυμνασίου that was found in Lindos (I. Lindos I, 139; still listed in the chronological catalogue of Rhodian inscriptions by Badoud 2015, 229 no. 597) is clearly a *pierre errante* from Cyprus (see K.-F. Kinch in the commentary to I. Lindos I, 139; BE 1942, 176 and the new edition by Mitford 1960).

19 Robert 1966a, 84 n. 1 argued that Kallistratos had received his *gymnasiarchia* posthumously, referring to the phrase ἰς αἰῶνον μνάμιον καὶ ἐπώνυμον τειμάν used in 26 e, l. 14–15 and g, l. 12–13. I am not convinced that this interpretation is compelling, since in this case, the fact that the honorand was deceased would have been made explicit on only two of the eight bases of the monument – and notably not on his own (26 f).

a foundation providing money for the funding of the *gymnasion* in the future, is attested for Rhodes only in this text, and an eponymous *gymnasiarchia* just in one other.²⁰ However, the accentuation of financial aspects, specifically the distribution of oil, is associated with both *gymnasiarchiai* of the *polis* in a number of other inscriptions since the middle of the first century AD. But in all instances, the office and the distribution, the θέσις τοῦ ἐλαίου, while being closely connected, remain two distinct entities. And there is no indication that the distribution was not a voluntary act of the *gymnasiarchos*. On the contrary: The frequent emphasis of the fact that the *gymnasiarch* had contributed oil for a whole year – in one instance (22) explicitly even for all 13th months of an intercalary year – suggests that at least the extent of the distribution was not taken for granted. And in a Rhodian decree of the first century AD regulating the distribution and the sale of oil, probably in the *gymnasion*, the *gymnasiarchoi* are not mentioned at all. Rather, the duty is assigned to unspecified men who were responsible for allotted days (29). If a *gymnasiarchos* defrayed the costs of the distribution, he was probably relieving these men voluntarily. So there is no indication that on Rhodes γυμνασιαρχεῖν ever came to mean ‘to distribute oil’ in itself. And supplying the *gymnasion* with oil had of course already been an issue in the Hellenistic age. For Rhodes, there is the well-known passage in Polybius documenting that Hieron and Gelon of Syracuse donated oil for the “*choregia* of providing oil to the users of the *gymnasion*” after the great earthquake of 227 BC, and evidence for the term θέσις τοῦ ἐλαίου dates back to the first century BC.²¹

Kallistratos’ young age at his *gymnasiarchia* has a parallel in another inscription from the Imperial age: In the

middle of the second century AD, a man called Damagoras was *gymnasiarchos neoterios* in the year his father held the eponymous priesthood of Halios (23, l. 3–6). Yet if we look at the Hellenistic evidence, the picture is rather similar. A number of CV inscriptions make it possible to reconstruct patterns in the chronological order in which Rhodians exercised public functions, and some of these texts are detailed enough to estimate the approximate age of the office holder at certain stages of his CV. The best example is a block of a statue base from the first half of the first century BC, featuring the longest known Rhodian CV from the Hellenistic age (10). This inscription probably includes the most detailed report on the offices a single person held in a *polis* of the Hellenistic age. Since it is nearly impossible to translate the catalogues of technical terms while retaining (or at least imitating) the syntactic structure and the layout of the original, I instead provide tabular overviews which separately list the honorand, the dedicants and – most importantly – the individual offices and additional information related to them, and also sum up longer entries of minor interest in the present context, such as decorations bestowed upon the honorand.

The honorand, whose name can be restored as Polykles based on the plausible assumption that he was the fraternal grandfather of the fourth dedicant, had held a number of military posts and high civic offices in Rhodes. During his career which reached its peak when he was chairman of the Rhodian council (*prytanis*) in the First Mithridatic War,²² he had held all three aforementioned *gymnasiarchiai*, having been, in this order, tribal *gymnasiarchos*, *gymnasiarchos neoterios* and *gymnasiarchos presbyteros*. Leaving the first function aside for later inspection, the other two are clearly placed in dis-

20 For the meaning of αἰώνιος (or δι’ αἰῶνος) γυμνασιαρχία see Robert 1960, 294–298 (Robert 1969, 810–814) and Robert 1966a, 83–85; cf. Scholz 2015, 87–88. The qualification of an office as ‘perpetual’ was not limited to the *gymnasiarchia*: Laum 1914, 46–50. While Blinkenberg was puzzled by the apparent contradiction between ἐπώνυμος and δι’ αἰῶνος in the denomination of the *gymnasiarchia* (I. Lindos II, 465, comm. to f), Louis Robert believed that the problem could be explained easily (Robert 1966a, 84 n. 1): Based on his assumption that Kallistratos was honoured posthumously (see above), he argued that ἐπώνυμος is used to demonstrate the link of the honorand’s name to the annual distributions made in his memory. But this interpretation is difficult to reconcile with the fact that a *gymnasiarchos* quite certainly appears in a dating formula alongside the priest of Athana Lindia on the Lindian statue base 25. Why and in which context this kind of eponymic dating was used remains unclear. It is improbable that the practice was confined to Lindos, since there is no discernible reason why the Lindians alone should have

distinguished a magistracy held in the city of Rhodes in this way.

21 Polyb. 5.88.5: Ἰέρων γὰρ καὶ Γέλων ... ἔδωκαν ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ πέντ’ ἄργυρίου τάλαντα πρὸς τὴν εἰς τὸ ἔλαιον τοῖς ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ χορηγίαν. As the sum of 75 talents of silver is disproportionately high, a reference to the restoration of the city’s fortifications has probably been lost in the textual tradition: Walbank 1957, 617–618. For the provision of oil to the Hellenistic *gymnasion* in general and the growing requirements put on local elites by the end of royal euergetism see Fröhlich 2009. The first reference to the θέσις τοῦ ἐλαίου in Rhodes is 15; the testimonials from the Imperial age are 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22; cf. the ἐλαιοθέσια to the Lindians mentioned in 26 e, l. 13–14 and g, l. 10–12.

22 10, l. 13: ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ. This war can be identified by the *nauarchos* Damagoras mentioned in l. 14, who is also known from narrative sources (cf. Kontorini 1993, 94–96). For the dating of his latest offices cf. Appendix II.

		line	date	age
honorand	[Polykles – – –]			
	Sosos, Polykles and Kalliarista,			
dedicants	Polykles, son of Polykles, grandson of Polykles (grandchildren)	1–2		
	military service on light and heavy warships (ἄφρακτα and κατάφρακτοι νᾶες) in wartime (κατὰ πόλεμον)	3–4		20–25
	unsalaried commander (ἀγεμῶν ἄμισθος) in the Lindian <i>chora</i>	4–5		
	<i>gymnasiarchos</i> of a <i>phyle</i> and victorious at the <i>Poseidania</i> , <i>Rhomaia</i> and <i>Halieia</i>	5–6		25–30
	<i>gymnasiarchos neoterōs</i>	6		
	presided over elections of jurors by lot	7		30–35
	commander of a squadron of light warships (ἄρχων ἀφράκτων)	7		
	commander of a squadron of ‘fives’ (ἀγεμῶν πεντηρέων) in wartime (κατὰ πόλεμον)	8	102 BC	35–40
	appointed by the People			
	as commander of commanders (ἀγεμῶν τῶν ἀγεμόνων)	8–9		
	participant in a sea battle	9		
	<i>strategos</i> on the Mainland (Peraia) and re-elected twice	9–10		
	<i>gymnasiarchos presbyteros</i>	11		40–50
	secretary of the council (γραμματεὺς βουλᾶς) and crowned by his colleagues in office	12		
	<i>prytanis</i> ‘in the war’ and crowned by his colleagues in office	12–13	88–85 BC	50–55
	councillor of the <i>nauarchos</i> Damagoras	13		
	<i>phylarchos</i> and victorious at the <i>Epitaphia</i>	14–15		
	<i>trierarchos</i> of a ‘four’ (τετρήρης) and victorious at the examination of the ship	15–16		55–60
	<i>choregos</i> of the <i>pyrrhiche</i>	16		
	<i>trierarchos</i> of a ‘four’ (τετρήρης) in wartime (κατὰ πόλεμον)	17	78 BC (?)	60–65
	<i>choregos</i> at the tragedies and victorious at the <i>Alexandreia</i> and <i>Dionysia</i>	17–18		
honours	honoured by various associations and communities	18–36		

Tab. 1 CV in Maiuri 1925, 19–29 no. 18 (10).

tinct areas of his CV: He was *gymnasiarchos neoterios* in an early phase of his career after the general military service in the navy frequently recorded at the beginning of Rhodian CVs, a command in the territorial army (ἀγεμὼν ἄμισθος) that is also associated with young men in two other inscriptions, and being tribal *gymnasiarchos*.²³ When he was *gymnasiarchos presbyteros* he was evidently older, as he already had been *strategos* (στραταγός) three times and was on his way to becoming secretary of the council and *prytanis*. For this stage of his career, we have a close parallel in another, fragmentary statue base (8): Before the *gymnasiarchia*, the honorand whose name is lost had been treasurer, *strategos* and *prytanis*; afterwards, he had commanded a heavy warship, been victorious as a *choregos* (χωραγός) and held the eponymous priesthood of Kamiros (*damiourgos*).

Combining the positions of the *gymnasiarchiai* in the CV with the observation that the offices are sometimes qualified with adjectives leads to the conclusion that the *gymnasiarchoi* belonged to the respective age groups. However, the alternative use of the genitive plural implies that they were not simply a team of one younger and one older magistrate, but that each was responsible for his own age group. In recent literature, the Rhodian *neoterioi* and *presbyteroi* have been interpreted as age classes of the Rhodian youth (perhaps influenced by the subclassification of *epheboi* into *neoterioi*, *mesoi* and *presbyteroi* in Chios and some other *poleis*), or as minors and

adults.²⁴ But there is no compelling reason to assume that on Rhodes the terms were used any differently from what was customary in the Greek world, the *presbyteroi* being the older citizens, the *neoterioi* the younger, the dividing line usually set at the age of 30.²⁵ That the *neoterioi* were not called by the more frequent term *véoi* may be a simple linguistic variation reflecting the contrast to *presbyteroi* implied in the denomination of the two *gymnasiarchiai*. Or it may be connected to the fact that no *ephebeia* is attested on Rhodes, so that the *neoterioi* may have been comprised of the age classes called *neoi* and *epheboi* elsewhere.²⁶

If the *gymnasiarchoi* were members of the respective age groups using the *gymnasion*, this constituted a limiting factor in the control the *polis* exercised over the *gymnasiarchia*. In the case of the *gymnasiarchos* of the *neoterioi*, an obvious alternative would have been to select an older citizen to keep them in line.²⁷ And it is highly likely that the groups active in the *gymnasion* generally formed exclusive circles within their own age classes. For Rhodes, this assumption is supported by a statue base for a man holding this office dated to ca. 80–70 BC (11), listing about 450 names of Rhodians who participated in erecting the statue and who therefore are generally identified as *presbyteroi*. Even if the exact size of the Rhodian citizenry in the first century BC cannot be determined, it is obvious that 450 can only have been a small percentage of all male citizens aged over 30.²⁸

23 In Rhodian CVs, naval service is usually indicated by στρατευσάμενος ἐν τοῖς ἀφράκτοις καὶ ἐν ταῖς καταφράκτοις ναυσί or a similar formula (cf. Gabrielsen 1997, 95 and, for the evidence, 7, l. 10–11 and 12, l. 5–6). The posting as an unsalaried *hegemon* is also part of the CVs documented in 7 (l. 14: γενόμενον ἀγεμόνα ἄμισθον ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας τῆς ἐν ταῖς νάσσει, positioned likewise in between the naval service and the tribal *gymnasiarchia*) and on a stone shield dedicated by a Carian *koinon* listing naval service as the only other function of the honorand (Blümel 1991, 175–175 no. 782; Bresson, Brun, and Varinlioglu 2001, 188–189 no. 63, l. 4–7: γενομένου ἀγεμόνος ἄμισθου | ἐπὶ τε Ἀρτουβων καὶ Παραβλεια | καὶ στρατευσαμένου ἐν ταῖς καταφράκτοις ναυσί). It is also mentioned in the dedication IG XII, 3, 7: Γάιος Ρωμαῖ[ος] | στρατευσάμενος | ὑπὲρ Ἀμύντα Ἀριστέως | ἡγεμόνος ἄμισθου | [κ]ατὰ Ἀλεια | εὐνοίας ἔνεκα | θεοῖς.

24 Chankowski 2010, 200 (age classes of the Rhodian youth); Badoud 2010, 133 no. D 8 (*presbyteros* meaning ‘adult’, i.e. aged over 18 years); Badoud 2015, 120: “En l’absence de classe d’âge intermédiaire, le premier [sc. of the *gymnasiarchoi*] était responsable des mineurs, le second de majeurs”. For ephebic age classes, see Hin 2007, 147 n. 21–22 and Fröhlich 2013, 81–82.

25 Cf. Dreyer 2004, 213; Fröhlich 2013, 82.

26 For the terms *neoi* and *neoterioi*, see Forbes 1933, 60–61 (referring to I. Sestos 1, l. 71, where νεώτεροι is employed instead of νέοι καὶ ἔφηβοι used otherwise in the decree); Knoepfler 1979, 176; Gauthier and Hatzopoulos

1993, 77; Dreyer 2004, 214; van Bremen 2013, 33–34 (with n. 9: “*Neoterioi* was used only in opposition to *presbyteroi*”); cf. Fröhlich 2013, 82–84; Kennell 2013; Curty 2015, 63 with n. 83. For the arguments against an *ephebeia* in Rhodes see Chankowski 2010, 198–206 with Kah 2016, 268. According to Chankowski’s convincing argumentation, the *epheboi* mentioned in 1 are a case in point, since in the early Hellenistic age the term usually denoted the members of an *ephebeia* and not an age group in athletic contests. Therefore, the divergent Rhodian usage indicates that the Rhodians did not have the institution at this time, and there are no later epigraphic attestations to an *ephebeia* apart from local institutions in the subject Peraia (cf. n. 17).

27 For the *neoi* as a “disruptive element” in the *polis* cf. van Bremen 2013, 33–44.

28 For 11 cf. Appendix II. According to various demographic models, individuals over 30 years of age made up between half and three-quarters of a pre-modern adult male population (cf. the literature cited in Kah 2014, 161 n. 90), and the Rhodian citizenry must have been substantially larger than 2000. A similar small sample is documented in a decree of the *presbyteroi* of Iasos, probably from the second half of the second century BC, indicating a total of 74 ballots cast in the voting (I. Iasos 93; Fröhlich 2013, 106–107 no. 2, l. 23). Parallel accounts in decrees of the *polis* of Iasos specify between ca. 800 and 1100 votes in the assembly (for the evidence see Fabiani 2012, 114–115; Fröhlich 2013, 80 n. 86 and Kah 2014,

		line
honorand	---	
dedicant(s)	---	
public offices and functions	treasurer (<i>tamias</i>)	1
	<i>strategos</i> in the <i>chora</i>	1–2
	<i>prytanis</i>	2
	<i>gymnasiarchos</i> of the <i>presbyteroi</i>	3
	[<i>agonothetes</i> (?)]	3–4
	<i>trierarchos</i> of a ‘five’ (πεντήρης)	4
	<i>choregos</i> at the comedies and victorious	5
	<i>damiourgos</i> in Kamiros	6
honours	honoured by various associations and communities	6–12

Tab. 2 CV in Maiuri 1925, 35–36 no. 21 (8)

		line	age
honorand	---		
dedicant(s)	---		
public offices and functions	victorious at the <i>Halieia</i> in boys’ wrestling	2	<18
	<i>trierarchos</i> of a two-banked ship	2–3	?
	<i>phylarchos</i> of the <i>phyle Lindia</i> and victorious at the <i>Epitaphia</i>	3–4	?
	military service on light and heavy warships (ἄφρακτα and κατάφρακτοι νᾶες) and honoured by his comrades	4–6	20–30
	<i>trierarchos</i> of a light warship (ἄφρακτον)	6	30–35
	<i>gymnasiarchos</i> of the <i>neoteroi</i>	7	~ 30 ?
honours	crowned by boards (!) of magistrates (<i>synarchiai</i>)	7–8	

Tab. 3 CV in I. Lindos II 707 (12).

It is interesting to compare an instance where an honorand of an inscription is called γυμνασίαρχος νεωτέρων in his CV (12): The man in question, called Pausanias, son of Leon, was active in the first half of the first

century BC, and must have been rather young when his statue base was commissioned by the council of Rhodes, as most of the functions listed are typical of the early part of a public career: victory in a boys’ wrestling contest,

168), so that the men voting for the decree can only represent a fraction of the citizens aged over 30 (cf. Fröhlich 2013, 80–81). Cf. also a statue base of a *gymnasiarchos* found in Notion, naming 153 *neoi* requesting the

honour from the *boule* (SEG 55, 1251; Curty 2015, 330–333), in contrast to voting results numbering between ca. 900 and 2000 documented for the assembly of the associated *polis* of Kolophon (Duplouy 2013).

service in the navy, command of a light warship (ἄφρακτον), and the *gymnasiarchia* of the *neoterói*. Assuming the CV is ordered chronologically, one could argue that it is unlikely that Pausanias was *trierarchos* of a regular warship while still being a *neoterós*. So it is possible that he became *gymnasiarchos* of the *neoterói* later, the designation γυμνασίαρχος νεωτέρων indicating that he did not belong to this age group himself anymore. Yet the positioning of the command of a small two-banked warship and the *phylarchia* before general military service in the navy is difficult to reconcile with a chronological order. In most other CVs, the military service is the first entry, only occasionally preceded by activities of boys (such as the wrestling victory here). One solution might be that the first three entries all cover activities of the honorand as a minor, since an explicit attestation of a *phylarchos* of men might indicate that there were *phylarchoi* of boys as well.²⁹ However, the CV's chronological order could simply be jumbled.³⁰

In any case, it does not seem possible to explain the variation γυμνασίαρχος πρεσβυτέρων in a similar way. Since the office holder can hardly have been too young to be a *presbyteros*, the only alternative explanation would be that he was too old. But even accepting the assumption that there was a maximum age for the *presbyterói* – which is, as far as I know, neither supported by the sources in general nor by the Rhodian evidence – this explanation would not conform to the only attestation of the term γυμνασίαρχος πρεσβυτέρων which appears in a seemingly chronologically ordered CV before the command of a heavy warship and several other public offices (8, l. 3), virtually excluding the possibility that the

honorand was already elderly at the time.

The third *gymnasiarchia* attested on Rhodes is the office of γυμνασίαρχος φυλαῖ or φυλαῶς.³¹ In 10 discussed above, it is attested for a young man at the start of his public career. This age is confirmed by two other inscriptions: In 7, the honorand Lysimachos was probably in his late twenties or early thirties, as he was already married and had two daughters, while his public career was still limited to his service in the navy, a posting as ἀγεμὼν ἄμισθος in the territorial army on the island and the tribal *gymnasiarchia*. In the second inscription (4), the tribal *gymnasiarchia* is named first in a compact selection of public functions cumulating in the offices of *tamias*, *strategos* and *prytanis*.

In the CV of Polykles (10, l. 7–8), the entry γυμνασίαρχησας φυλαῶς is combined with victories at agonistic festivals.³² Two fragmentary victory lists of the Great Erethimia from the early third century BC show that the tribal *gymnasiarchoi* were connected with the torch race teams (1). The official named first together with the victorious tribe is not the *gymnasiarchos* but the *phylarchos*, the latter function being attested more often in Rhodian CV inscriptions. It is usually listed with victories at agonistic festivals and seems to have been performed by older men, like the *gymnasiarchia* of the *presbyterói*. Since in other places, torch racing teams were organised by *lampadarchoi*, the Rhodian *phylarchia* and the tribal *gymnasiarchia* should be local variations of this liturgy. As there were two races, one of *andres* and one of *epheboi*, Vassa Kontorini has proposed that the *phylarchos* was responsible for the former group, the *gymnasiarchos* for the

29 Pugliese Carratelli 1952–1954a, 262 no. 6: Πύθων Λύωνος | Ἰστάγιος | φυλαρχήσας ἀνδρῶν | καὶ νικάσας | Διὶ Ὀρλυγίῳι. There were torch races of *epheboi* in Rhodes, but the official in charge of their teams was probably the tribal *gymnasiarchos* (cf. p. 282–283). If the honorand of 12 was *phylarchos* of boys as a minor, he must have been something like the team captain, and the *trierarchia* of the two-banked ship mentioned before (12, l. 2–3: τριηραρχήσαντα | [δι]κρότου, to be complemented by πλοίου or ναός) might have been a similar position in a boys' boat race. The term deviates from the usual, well-attested Rhodian naval nomenclature, with only a single parallel in IGR IV, 1116, l. 4 (τριηραρχήσαν<τα> ἐπικώπου πλοίου δικρότου) that is conspicuous by asserting that the *dikroton* was a ship (πλοῖον) as well as equipped with oars (ἐπικώπος), both characteristics being self-evident in a warship. I am not convinced by the interpretation offered by Gabrielsen 1997, 102–105, that these expressions designate privately owned warships, especially since the scant attestations do not correspond to the widespread use of these kinds of vessels assumed by Gabrielsen.

30 An inattentive redaction of the inscription might also explain the entry

stating that the honorand had been crowned by (several) *synarchiai* (12, l. 7–8: στεφανωθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν | [σ]υναρχ[ιῶν]) although the inscription mentions only one office (the *gymnasiarchia*) that could have been part of such a board of magistrates.

31 Cf. Pugliese Carratelli 1953, 76–77; Kontorini 1975, 111; Cordiano 1997, 137–138; Schuler 2004, 166; Chankowski 2010, 200; Badoud 2015, 120 with n. 88.

32 The festivals named are the Poseidania, the Rhomaia and the Halieia (l. 5–6), indicating that Polykles had either been tribal *gymnasiarchos* repeatedly or (since that should be indicated by the addition of a multiplicative adverb) that the festivals named had all been held in a single year. In this case, the Halieia mentioned should be the lesser annual version of the festival (cf. SIG³ III, 1067 comm. at l. 12; Arnold 1936, 435; Morelli 1959, 97), since the pentaeteric μεγάλα Ἀλιεῖα (cf. e.g. 7, l. 15) were celebrated within two years distance of the Rhomaia (cf. the reconstruction of the Rhodian festival cycle in the first century BC by Badoud 2015, 133–134).

		line	age
honorand	Lysimachos, son of Aristeidias	1	
dedicants	Aristeidias, son of Aristeidias (father)		
	Gorgon, Aristeidias, Philinna, Timakrate (brothers and sisters)		
	Boulakrate, daughter of Isidotos (wife)		
	Boulakrate and Gorgo, daughters of Aristeidias (daughters)		
	Isodotos, son of Aratogenes (father in law)	2–9	
public offices and functions	military service on <i>tribemioliai</i> and heavy warships (κατάφρακτοι νᾶες)		
	and honoured by an association of soldiers (Παναθηναϊστῶν στρατευομένων κοινόν)		
	and crowned with a golden crown	10–13	20–30
	unsalaried commander (ἀγεμὼν ἄμισθος) in the <i>chora</i> on the island (Rhodes)	14	
	<i>gymnasiarchos</i> of a <i>phyle</i> (in a year with the) <i>Halieia megala</i>	15	

Tab. 4 CV in Jacopi 1932b, 190–192 no. 19 (7).

		line
honorand	Eudamos, son of Dexicharis	1
dedicant	Gorgon, son of Timokles, adoptive son of Diokles	2–3
	(ward of Eudamos)	4–5
public offices and functions	<i>gymnasiarchos</i> of a <i>phyle</i>	6
	<i>trierarchos</i>	7
	commander over Karia (ἀγεμὼν ἐπὶ Καρίας)	8
	treasurer (<i>tamias</i>)	9
	<i>strategos</i> on the mainland (Peraia)	10
	<i>prytanis</i>	11

Tab. 5 CV in Jacopi 1932b, 192–193 no. 20 (4).

latter.³³ That seems plausible, but it is curious that the tribe's name is recorded only with the *phylarchos*, giving the impression that he and the *gymnasiarchos* belonged to the same *phyle*. Since the two victorious teams can hardly have been from the same tribe on a regular basis, it should also be considered that both officials belonged to the team of the *andres*, making the *gymnasiarchos* some kind of team captain.

Another unexplained point is why the tribal officials were called *gymnasiarchoi* in the first place. Their attested area of activity, their youthful age and their subordinate position to the *phylarchoi* virtually exclude the possibility that they were responsible for local *gymnasia*. Furthermore, there is no evidence for such institutions in the first place. The urbanised tribal centres of Lindos and Kamiros may have had some kind of facilities for physical training that remain unknown due to the limited archaeological exploration of these sites. The foundations promised by the family of Kallistratos in the late second century AD illustrate the situation in Lindos, distinguishing a 'perpetual' *gymnasiarchia* for the *polis* from equally 'eternal' annual distributions of oil (ἐλαιοθέσια) for the Lindians (26 e, l. 6–16 and g, l. 5–3). Thus, the latter apparently had need of oil without possessing an institutionalised *gymnasion*. And the Ialyseis did not have any reason to have a *gymnasion* of their own in the first place, as Ialysos had evolved into a village after the *synoikismos* in 408 BC, with the majority of the population migrating to the new city of Rhodos. Finally, the possibility that the tribal *gymnasiarchia* refers to a local institution antedating the *synoikismos* is rendered improbable by the evolution of the *gymnasiarchia* in general. So the reason for this denomination of the function remains enigmatic.

In any event, the tribal *gymnasiarchos* demonstrates that apart from the magistracies of the *polis*, one also has to take into account the possibility of offices of subdivisions such as tribes. In this context, it is interesting to observe that the tribal *gymnasiarchia* not only appears in the context of the *phylai* of the city of Rhodes, but also in a victory list of an association (6). In a close parallel

to the victory lists mentioned above, the catalogue has seven entries dated by an *agonothetes*, followed by the victorious *phyle*, the *phylarchos* and the *gymnasiarchos*. The association had obviously copied a part of Rhodian public organisation on a lesser scale: Like the *polis*, the *koinon* was divided into three *phylai*, named after its founder, his wife and his daughter-in-law, and held games with contesting tribal teams.

3 Conclusion

The Rhodian evidence shows that while the distribution of oil was an increasingly important aspect of the *gymnasiarchia* under the Roman Empire, there is no indication that it was ever seen as primarily liturgical. In the inscriptions, the distribution is added to the office and treated as a voluntary munificence. Other aspects of the office remained unchanged: Since the Hellenistic age, the Rhodians had two annual *gymnasiarchoi*, one for the younger men (*neoteroi*) and one for the older men (*presbyteroi*). While these officials were magistrates of the *polis*, their positions in Rhodian CV inscriptions show that they were recruited from the respective age groups, limiting the control the *polis* could exercise over the *gymnasion*. The third Rhodian *gymnasiarchia* was a tribal office exercised by young men in cooperation with an older official, the *phylarchos*, both offices being mentioned only in the context of organizing teams for torch races. Combined with the fact that these tribal offices were copied by a Rhodian *koinon*, this variation demonstrates that not every attestation of a *gymnasiarchos* has to be connected to a *gymnasion* or a public magistracy.

A further perspective for research offered by the Rhodian CVs would be a review of the status of the *gymnasiarchia* within the magistratures of a *polis*, the commonly held opinion being that the *gymnasiarchia* was one of the most important offices of the Hellenistic *polis* but lost some of its standing under the Roman Empire.³⁴

33 Kontorini 1975, 109–111; cf. Schuler 2004, 166 and Chankowski 2010, 200 discussing only the *gymnasiarchia*. For the *lampadarchia* in general see Oehler 1924 (cf. the evidence from Priene cited above). The *phylarchos* is also mentioned in 10, l. 14–15 and 12, l. 3. For further epigraphic evidence cf. I. Lindos I, 222, comm. to l. 4–5 and Kontorini 1975, 109.

34 Cf. Scholz 2015, 89–90. The surprisingly low number of texts in the new collection of Hellenistic decrees for *gymnasiarchoi* (Curty 2015) actually

encourages to question the importance of the *gymnasiarchia* in this age. Even allowing for the fact that Curty did not include decrees giving no information about the activities of a *gymnasiarchos* or fragmentary texts, the number of only 40 – including three excerpts from decrees for an honorand who had held a greater number of offices from Priene (no. 24–26), and to be enlarged by the addition of seven decrees from Pergamon only listed in a short appendix (Curty 2015, 335–336) – seems quite mod-

Contrasting with this, evidence for the *gymnasiarchia* in the Rhodian CVs seems to stay remarkably unchanged over time. While the few references to the tribal *gymnasiarchos* are all from Hellenistic inscriptions, both *gymnasiarchoi* of the *polis* feature in CVs from the second century BC to the second century AD. The rich Rhodian material would make it possible to contrast the nine CVs mentioning the *gymnasiarchia* to those which do not. The overall number of CVs in Rhodian inscriptions being at least several dozen, *gymnasiarchoi* are obviously mentioned in just a fraction of them. It would take a detailed investigation of this type of inscription to reveal the information necessary to put this observation into perspective, such as the chronological development of the CVs and the public functions listed in them, or the selective criteria discernible from their composition.

est, compared with, e.g., the ca. 180 known decrees for foreign judges (cf. Cassayre 2010, 131–154 with a preliminary catalogue). The geographical distribution of the decrees also needs to be investigated further, since

those cities represented in the collection mostly contribute just a single text, while a lot of *poleis* with an otherwise rich epigraphic documentation are conspicuously absent (cf. Kah 2017).

Appendix I: Epigraphic sources

(A) The Rhodian *gymnasiarchoi*

1 Victory lists of the *megala Erethimia*, Rhodos, ca. 280–270 BC: Kontorini 1975, 96–117: Cf. Chankowski 2010, 443 no. 2; Badoud 2015, 166–167 no. A 10 and 171 no. A 30.

face A: ἐπ' ἱερέως [Διο]πείθευς καὶ ἱεροποιῶν τῶν σὺν Ἀγησιπλόλ[ει] | καὶ ἀγων[οθέ]τα Ἀγησιπτόλιος τοῦ Δάμωνος τ[ο]ίδε ἐ[ν]ί[κω]ν | τὰ μεγάλα Ἐρεθίμ[ια]· | ἐφήβων [λα]μπάδι ἀ[π]ὸ π[ρ]άτας | Εὐδαμος Ἀ[γ]ασμένευσ, | ἀνδρῶν | [Τ]ιμ[ό]θε[ο]ς Τιμα[— —], | φ[ύ]λαρχος λα[μπάδι] | Α[ν]δ[ρ]ί[α]ς | [Κ]λέαρχος Τ[— —], | γυ[μ]νασίαρχ[ος] | Εὐ[π]ραξί[α]ς Ἀ[— —] | — —.

face B, l. 1–3 and 21–27: [ἐ]π' ἱερέω[ς] — — — καὶ ἱεροποιῶν τῶν σὺν — — — | κα[ὶ] ἀγων[ο]θέτα — — — τοῖδε ἐνίκων | τ[ὰ] μεγά[λα] Ἐρεθίμ[ια]· | ... | [λαμπ]άδι ἀπὸ π[ρ]άτας ἐφήβων |]σίμαχο[ς] — — —, | ἀνδ[ρ]ῶν | [Βό]ηθος Πασ[ικ] — — —, | φ[ύ]λαρχος λα[μπάδι] | Ἰαλ[υ]σί[α]ς | [Κα]λλιφῶν Ἀ[— — —], | γυ[μ]νασίαρχ[ος] | Φί[λων] Φιλοκ[λέ] — — —.

2 Fragment of a dedication, Rhodos, first half of the third century BC: Kondis 1952, 562–563 no. BE 912; SEG 15, 499.

— — — | [— — —] Ἀλέξων Α[— — —] | — — — Ἀγλούμ-
βροτ[ος] — — — | — — — γυ[μ]νασίαρχ[ή]σαντες — — — | — — —.

The restoration is suggested by the parallel in 13.

3 Fragment of a dedication, Loryma, third century BC (?): M. Chaviaras and N. D. Chaviaras 1907, 211 no. 3; Blümel 1991, 8–9 no. 10; Bresson 1991, 165 no. 181. Cf. Chankowski 2010, 444–445 no. 7.

— — — | [— — —] Ἰσας | [— — —] γυ[μ]νασίαρχ[ή]σας | [— — —] ΩΝΙ.

Blümel's restoration ἐφηβάρχ[ή]σας in l. 1 is not sufficiently justified, since the parallels are from Mobolla (cf. n. 17) and there is no indication that Loryma had magistracies of its own, much less a *gymnasion* or an *ephebeia*. The remains could also be restored as one of a number of other offices indicated by a participle (e.g. στραταγ[ή]σας); cf. Bresson who abstains from restoring l. 1 and Chankowski 2010, 445. The inscription could have named two magistrates making the offering or one dedicant with a short CV.

Based on the form of the Sigma reproduced by

Chaviaras, Bresson hesitantly dates the inscription to the fourth or third century BC (“les *eta* ouverts” must be a misprint since there is only one Eta in the preserved text and the letter form cannot be characterised as “open” anyway). The mention of the *gymnasiarchos* makes a fourth-century date improbable, and if the inscription comprised a CV, this should date it to even later than the third century.

In l. 3, Bresson retains the restoration [Ἀπόλλ]ωνι proposed in the *editio princeps*, but Blümel, arguing that a dedication to Apollon made by a *gymnasiarchos* is unlikely, considers reading — — — ΩΝΙ I[— — —].

4 Statue base, Rhodos, first half of the second century BC (after 188 BC): Jacopi 1932b, 192–193 no. 20; DNO IV, 3286. Cf. Badoud 2015, 211 no. 148.

l. 6–11: καὶ γυμνασιαρχήσαντος φυλάς | καὶ τριη-
ραρχήσαντος | καὶ γενομένου ἀγεμόνος ἐπὶ Καρίας | καὶ
ταμιεύσαντος | καὶ στραταγήσαντος ἐν τῷ πέραν | καὶ
πρυτανεύσαντος.

5 Collection of decrees concerning the library (βιβλιοθήκη), Rhodos, second century BC.

Two fragments of originally at least four slabs, arranged two-by-two (cf. Rosamilia 2014, 332–334 and 353). Frg. a, containing minor remains of two decrees is part of the slab on the upper left, frg. b (still unpublished) is the lower-right slab carrying the right half of the text of three decrees. On the inscription, see Rosamilia 2014.

The inscriptions have been palaeographically dated to the second century. There are some historical arguments for a date after 168 BC (Wiemer 2002, 334 with n. 38) that will have to be reappraised once frg. b. has been published in full. The narrowing of the date to 140–120 BC proposed by Rosamilia 2014, 354–355 is based on a weak prosopographical parallel only.

Frg. a: Maiuri 1925, 7 no. 4; Rosamilia 2014, 349–355.

Frg. b: Papachristodoulou 1986 (excerpts and photo); Papachristodoulou 1990 (description and photo); cf. SEG 37, 699; Bringmann 2002, 72–73; Hoepfner 2002, 68–72 (with a hypothetical identification and reconstruction of the building); Chankowski 2010, 199 n. 278; Coqueugniot 2013, 134–136; Drelis-Iraklidou 2014, 44; Rosamilia 2014, 332–349.

In the second and third decree of frg. b, the first two lines after the date contain the phrase εἰς τὰν

βυ[βλι]οθήκων, ἃν ἔχοντι τοῖ | [γυμνασιάρχου] ἐν παρα-
- - (probably παραθήκαι, παρακαταθήκαι or παραφυ-
λακῆαι) and εἰς τὸν βυβλιοθήκων, ἃν ἔχοντι τοῖ γυμνα-
σιάρχου ἐν παρα- - - respectively. On this basis, the
same phrase can be supplemented in the first (or second)
line of the second decree on Frg. a (l. 11): εἰς τὸν βυβλιο-
θήκων, ἃν ἔχοντι τοῖ γυμνασιάρχου ἐν παρα- - -.

The *gymnasiarchoi* are mentioned several times in
other parts of the decrees: frg. a, l. 6 (εἰ δὲ τίς κα τῶν
γυμνασιάρχων μὴ ἀναγρ[άφῃ]) and more often in the
unpublished text (cf. Papachristodoulou 1986, 267; Rosa-
milia 2014, 335–336). The plural probably refers to the
gymnasiarchos presbyteros and the *gymnasiarchos neoteris*
concurrently in office (cf. Segre 1935, 219), rather than
to a series of individual *gymnasiarchoi* in the future.

6 Victory lists of a *koinon*, Rhodos, mid-second
century BC: IG XII, 1, 127 A. Cf. Maillot 2009 and
Badoud 2015, 207 no. 51.

The list has seven entries following the pattern ἐπὶ
ἀγωνοθέτα τοῦ δεῖνος ἐνίκει φυλὰ ..., φύλαρχος ὁ δένα,
γυμνασιάρχος ὁ δεῖνα. There are three *phylai* (Νικασιω-
νήϊς, Βασιληῖς, Ὀλυμπιῖς), named after the founder of
the *koinon*, Nikasion from Kyzikos, his wife Olympias
from Soloi and their daughter-in-law, a Rhodian called
Basilis, daughter of Demetrios (cf. face B, l. 58–64).

7 Statue base, Rhodos, late second century BC:
Jacopi 1932b, 190–192 no. 19; DNO V, 3986.

l. 10–15: στρατευσάμενον ἐν τριημιολίαι καὶ ἐν ταῖς
| καταφράκτοις ναυσὶ καὶ | τιμαθέντα ὑπὸ Παναθηναῖ-
στῶν στρατευομένων τοῦ κοινοῦ | καὶ στεφανωθέντα
χρυσέῳ στεφάνῳ καὶ | γενόμενον ἀγεμόνα ἄμισθον ἐπὶ
τῆς χώρας τῆς ἐν ταῖς νάσῳ | καὶ γυμνασιαρχήσαντα
φυλαῖ κατὰ Ἀλῆια μεγάλα.

8 Fragment of a statue base, Rhodos, second or
first century BC: Maiuri 1925, 35–36 no. 21 with correc-
tions by Pugliese Carratelli 1952–1954a, 311 n. 2.

l. 1–6: - - - | [τα]μιεύσαν[τ]α κατ[ὰ] Ἀλῆια
καὶ στραταγήσαντα ἐπὶ | τῆς χώρας καὶ πρυ-
τανεύσαν[τα] ±10 καὶ | γυμνασι[αρχή]σαντα πρεσ-
βυτέρων [καὶ ἀγωνοθε[τή]σαντ[α] (?) καὶ τρι-
ηρα[ρ]χήσαντα πεντή[ρε]υς καὶ | χ[ο]ραγήσαντα κω-
μωδῶν κ[αὶ] ν[ικ]άσαντ[α] ± 5 (?) καὶ | δαμουργήσαντα
ἐν Καμίρῳ.

Maiuri's restoration καὶ [στραταγήσαντα ἐπὶ | τῆς
χώρας in l. 1 is too short, and the spacing between KA
and the lower end of a vertical stroke indicated by his

drawing fits KAT better than KAI. In l. 4, Maiuri has
πεντή[ρε]ων (with ΠΕΝΤΕ in the drawing) but when a
type of ship is added to the title of a *trierarchos* in Rho-
dian inscriptions, it is always named in the singular.

9 Statue base, Rhodos, ca. 100–90 BC: Maiuri
1925, 32–35 no. 20; Badoud 2015, 398 no. 31.

--- | [ἀ]βου[λ]ὰ [ἀ]βου[λ]εύσας[α] τῆ[ν] | ἐξάμηνον
| τὰν ἐπ' ἱερέως Ἀγλωχάρτου | καὶ ἐπ' ἱερέως Φαινίλα
| καὶ τοῖ συνάρχαντες | πρυτάνεις, γραμματεῖς βουλᾶς,
| στραταγοί, ταμίαι, ἀστυνόμοι, | ἀγωνοθέται, γυμνα-
σιάρχου, | ἐπίσκοποι, ἀγορανόμοι, ἐμπορίου | ἐπιμελη-
ταί, | ἐπιστάται τῶν παίδων, | σιτοφύλακες, | κᾶρυξ
βουλᾶ καὶ δάμῳ. | θεοῖς.

10 Statue base with CV, Rhodos, ca. 70 BC:
Maiuri 1925, 19–29 no. 18. Cf. Kah 2016, 270–271; for
the date cf. Appendix II.

l. 3–18: [σ]τρατευσά[μ]ενον ἐν τε τοῖς ἀφράκτοις
καὶ ἐν ταῖς καταφράκτοις | [να]υσὶ κατὰ πόλεμον καὶ
γενόμενον ἀγεμόνα ἄμισθον ἐπὶ τῆς | [χ]ώρας τῆς
Λινδίας καὶ γυμνασιαρχήσαντα φυλᾶ[ς] καὶ νικάσαν-
τα | [Π]οσειδάνια καὶ Ῥωμαῖα καὶ Ἀλῆια καὶ γυμνα-
σιαρχήσαντα νεώτερον | [καὶ κ]λαρωτῶν δικαστῶν γε-
νόμενον καὶ ἄρχαντα ἀφράκτων καὶ | [ἀγ]ησάμενον
πεντηρέων κατὰ πόλεμον καὶ ἀποδείχθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ |
δάμου ἀγεμόνα τῶν ἀγεμόνων καὶ ναυμαχίασαντα καὶ
στραταγή[σαντα] ἐν τῷ πέραν καὶ ἐπιχειροτονηθέντα
τὸ δεύτερον καὶ ἐπιχειρο[τονηθέντα] τὸ τρίτον καὶ γυμ-
νασιαρχήσαντα πρεσβύτερον καὶ | γραμματῇ βουλᾶς
γενόμενον καὶ στεφανωθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν συναρχόντων
| καὶ πρυτανεύσαντα ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ καὶ στεφανω-
θέντα ὑπὸ τῶν συναρχόντων καὶ γενόμενον σύμβου-
λον ναυάρχῳ Δαμαγόρῳ καὶ φυλαρχήσαντα καὶ νι-
κάσαντα ἐπιτάφια καὶ τριηραρχήσαντα τετρήρευς | καὶ
νικάσαντα ταῖς ἀποδείξει τῆς ναὸς καὶ χ[ο]ραγήσαντα
πυρρίχαι | καὶ τριηραρχήσαντα τετρήρευς κατὰ πόλε-
μον καὶ χοραγήσαντα | τραγωιδῶν καὶ νικάσαντα Ἀλε-
ξάνδρεια καὶ Διονύσια.

11 Statue base, Rhodos, ca. 80–70 BC (?): IG
XII, 1, 46; Badoud 2015, 399–404, no. 3. For the date and
further details see Appendix II.

l. 1–2 (part a Badoud): [Ἀσκληπι]άδαν Ἀνδρονίκο[ν]
| γυμνα[σίου]ρχον πρεσβύτερον κατὰ Ῥωμαῖα.

12 Statue base with CV, Lindos, ca. 85–40 BC:
I. Lindos II, 707 with a correction by Badoud 2015, 170
no. A 26.

l. 2–7: [νι]κάσαντα Ἀλῆια παῖδας πάλαν καὶ τριη-

ραρχήσαντα | [δι]κρότου καὶ φυλαρήσαντα φυλᾷς Λιν-
δίας καὶ νικάσαντα | [Ε]πιτάφια καὶ στρατευσάμενον
ἐν τε τοῖς ἀφράκτοις καὶ | [τ]αῖς καταφράκτοις ναυσὶ
καὶ στεφανωθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν | [σ]υστρατευσαμένων καὶ
τριηραρχήσαντα ἀφράκτου καὶ | [γ]υμνασιαρχήσαντα
νεωτέρων.

13 Dedication, Rhodes, ca. 60 BC: Maiuri 1925,
46–47 no. 36. On the date: Badoud 2015, 210 no. 127.

Θευφανίσκος Ἀρχοκράτης, | Κλεύθεμις Χαρι-
δάμου, | γυμνασιαρχήσαντες | κατὰ μέγала Ἀλκίεια.

14 Fragment of a statue base, Rhodes, first cen-
tury BC: Konstantinopoulos 1964, 11, no. 14; pl. 4 β.

[τὸν δεῖνα γυμν]ασιαρχήσαν[τα – – –] | Ἀφρο-
δείσιος ΑΘ[– – –] | Γυελῶν | Μόσχος | [Ρ]οδοκλῆς |
[– – –]Α[– – –] | – – –.

15 Fragmentary dedication, Rhodes, first cen-
tury BC: Kontorini 1989a, 56–59 no. 6; pl. VIII α; SEG
39, 738.

[ὁ δεῖνα γυμν]ασιαρχήσας [– – – | – – –]ΤΕΙ ὑπὸ
τοῦ θεοῦ [– – – | – – – καὶ ποιησάμενο]ς τὰν θέσιν τοῦ
ἐλ[αίου – – – | – – – Ἀλεξάνδ]ρεια (?), Ἀλκίω καὶ τῷ[ι
δάμωι – – –].

Dated to the first century BC, this inscription is con-
siderably older than the next epigraphic testimony for
the θέσις τοῦ ἐλαίου in 45 AD (18). But the use of Iota ad-
scriptum after Omega does not encourage a much later
dating of the dedication.

16 Fragment, Ialysos, Hellenistic: Jacopi 1932a,
107 no. 8; Papachristodoulou 1989, 175 no. 15.

– – – | [– – –]ερατ[– – – | – – – κ]αὶ γυμνας[– – –]
| – – –.

Likely a part of a CV, with ι]ερατ[εύσαντα and γυ-
μνας[ιαρχήσαντα (or other forms of the participles).

17 Statue base with CV, Rhodes, ca. 15–50 AD:
Pugliese Carratelli 1952–1954b, 240 no. 29 a.

l. 5: γυμνασιαρ]χήσαντα νεωτ[έ]ρων καὶ [.]ρλ[– –
–] | – – – (at the beginning of a CV).

The honorand is also known from a Lindian statue
base dated to 10 AD (I. Lindos II, 392 b), where apart
from a lot of honours he obviously received together
with his father and mother (cf. I. Lindos II, 391 and
392 a), the only activities of his mentioned are his ser-
vice in the fleet (documented only indirectly in an hon-
our by a military association) and a victory in a chariot
race (I. Lindos II, 392 b. l. 7–8). Thus he had probably
not yet held public office at this time. The *gymnasiarchia*

mentioned on 17 must be at least some years later, but
since the base is broken at the bottom it is also possible
that a long CV followed, dating the base closer to the
middle of the first century BC.

18 Statue base with CV, Rhodes, 45 AD: IG
XII, 1, 829; I. Lindos II, 384 d; Badoud 2015, 439–441
no. 63. On the date see Habicht 1990 (SEG 40, 668).

l. 4–14: ταμειύσα[ν]τ[α] καὶ γενόμενον γραμματῇ |
βουλᾷ καὶ [π]ρυτανεύσαντα καὶ πάντα | πράξαντα τὰ
συνφέροντα τῷ δάμῳ ἐν τῷ | τᾷς ἀ[ρχ]ᾷς χ[ρ]όνῳ καὶ
προφατεύσαντα | καὶ [γυμνασια]ρχήσαντα πρεσβύτε-
ρον καὶ | [ποιησάμ]ε[ν]ον τὰν θέσιν τοῦ ἐλαίου | [δω-
ρεάν καὶ ποι]ησάμενον καὶ τοῖς παισὶ τὰν | [θέσιν τοῦ
ἐλ]αίου καὶ πρεσβεύσαντα | πλ[ε]ο[ν]άκις, γεν[ο]όμενον
δὲ καὶ ἐν ἐπανγγελίαις | καὶ προ[ῖ]σφορα[ῖ]ς.

19 Statue base with CV, Lindos, ca. 70–120 AD:
I. Lindos II, 454.

l. 13–16: γυμνασιαρχή]σαντα νεώτερο[ν καὶ ποιη-
σάμενον] | τὰν θέσιν τοῦ ἐλ[αίου καὶ ἄρ]ξαντα | ἄρχᾷς.

Blinkenberg's date of 80–100 AD (accepted by
Badoud 2015, 239 no. 823 without discussion) is based
on his supplement καὶ ἱερατε[ύσαντα – – – τοῦ] | Αὐτο-
κράτο[ρο]ς [Καίσαρος Δομετ]ια[νοῦ] in l. 17–18. In the
commentary, he admits that the restoration is uncer-
tain and other emperors' names are also possible. He ar-
gues that Domitian fits the palaeography of the inscrip-
tion best, but Οὐεσπασια]νοῦ (which may be too long)
or Τραῖα]νοῦ (possibly preceded by Νέρουα instead of
Καίσαρος) would be chronologically well within the
margin of error of even a rather precise palaeographic
dating.

20 Statue base with CV, Lindos, between 80 and
90 AD: Bresson 2004, 225–228 no. 1 (combining Maiuri
1916, 147–148 no. 20 and I. Lindos II, 384 b and f); see
also Habicht 1990 and SEG 40, 668; cf. SEG 54, 721.

l. 8–16: γυμνα[σ]ιαρχήσαντα νεωτέρων καὶ ποιη-
σάμενον [τὰν] | θέσιν τοῦ ἐλα[ί]ου ἐκ τῶν ιδίων ἐπὶ
ὄλον τὸν ἐν[α]υτόν [καὶ] | πρεσβεύσαντ[α] ἰς Ῥώμαν
ποτὶ τοὺς Σεβαστοὺς δωρεάν καὶ | ποτὶ ἀνθυπάτους καὶ
στραταγούς Ῥωμαίων καὶ ἐπιτρόπους | τῶν Σεβαστῶν
ἵς τε Ἀχαιᾶν καὶ Ἀσίαν καὶ Λυκίαν πλεονάκις | καὶ καλ-
λίστω[ν] ἀποκριμ[ά]των ἀξιοθέντα, γενόμενον δὲ καὶ
| θεωρὸν ἰς τὸν ἀγόμενον ἀγῶνα ἐν Νεαπόλει καὶ ἐν
ἐπανγγελίαις καὶ προῖσφοραῖς.

21 Statue base with CV, Rhodes, between 80 and
90 AD: Pugliese Carratelli 1939–1940, 154–155 no. 14;

pl. XII; Bresson 2004, 228–230 no. 2; SEG 54, 723.

l. 5–14: γυμ[νασιαρχήσαντα | νεω]τέρων καὶ ποιη-
σάμενον τᾶν θέσιν τοῦ ἐλαίου | ἐκ [τ]ῶ[ν] ἱδ[ρ]ῶν ἐπὶ
μῆνας δέκα δύο κ[αὶ] ἱερατεύσαντα | Ἀθά[να]ς Λινδίας
καὶ Διὸς Πολιέως κ[αὶ] Ἀρτάμιτος | Κεκ[ρ]ίας καὶ πρε-
σβεύσαντα πλεονάκ[ις] ἰς Ῥώμαν | πο[τ]ί [τ]ε τοὺς Σε-
βαστοὺς καὶ ποτὶ ἀνθ[υ]πάτους καὶ | ποτὶ ἐπι[τ]ρόπους
καὶ τυχόντα τᾶ[ς] Ῥωμα[ίων] πολι[τείας] κα[ὶ] γενόμε-
νον ἀρχιθέωρον ἰς Ὀλυμπίαν | καὶ τ[ρ]απεζιτεύσαντα
καὶ πο[ι]ησάμε[νον] ἐπανγγελί[ας] κ[αὶ] προεἰσφορὰς μει-
ζόνων κεφαλᾶ[ίων].

The honorand whose name is lost is probably T. Flavius Aglochartos, honoured in 20 (as proposed by Bresson 2004, 230–232) since both CVs exhibit a number of similar entries: honours by the three tribal centres, the *gymnasiarchia* of the *neoteroi* and the θέσις τοῦ ἐλαίου, the priesthood of Athana Lindia and Zeus Polieus, the embassies, and participation in *epangeliai* and *proeisphorai*. However, both CVs also show some differences, which may be due to their respective redactions. But since neither the identical functions nor their sequence are uncommon, it is not impossible that the bases belonged to statues of two separate honorands with similar CVs.

22 Statue base with CV, Rhodos, ca. 100 AD: I. Lindos II, 449. Cf. Badoud 2015, 236 no. 821.

l. 5–8: τριηραρχήσαντα, ἱερατεύσα[ντα] | τῶν
Αὐτοκρατόρων, γυμνασιαρχήσαντα ποιη[σάμε]νον
τὰν θέσιν τοῦ ἐλαίου ἐπὶ μῆνας δεκατρεῖς,
ἀ[γω]νοθετήσαντα τοῦ ἱεροῦ τῶν Ἀλείων ἀγῶνος,
ταμ[ι]εύσαντα, πρυτανεύσαντα καὶ πρεσβεύσαντα,
τειμα[θ]έντα τρεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ δάμου τοῦ Ῥοδίων καὶ τοῦ
Λινδίων, | ἐν προεἰσφοραῖς καὶ ἐπιδόσεσιν π(λ)είοσιν
γενόμενον, | χοραγήσαντα δῖς, ἱερωνήσαντα.

For the intercalary 13th month in Rhodian chronology see Badoud 2015, 138–140.

23 Statue base with CV, Lindos, middle of the second century AD: I. Lindos II, 482 (see Appendix III).

l. 2–5: ἱερατεύσαντα | τοῦ προπάτορος Ἀλίου κατὰ
τὸ ἄ[στυ], τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ Δαμα[γ]όραν δ' γυμνασίαρχον
νεώτερ[ον] (or νεωτέρων) γενόμενον κατὰ τὸν ἐνιαυτ[ο]ν
τᾶς τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ἱερωσύν[ας].

l. 8–10: χρεοφυλακήσαντα, γυμ[να]σιαρχή[σαντα]
πρεσβύτερον (or πρεσβυτέρων), γραμμα[τε]ύσαντα βου-
λᾶς, ταμειύσαν[τα], στραταγήσαντα, πρυτανεύ[ι]σαντα.

24 Fragment of an honorary column, Rhodes, late first or second century AD: Maiuri 1925, 48–50

no. 38. Cf. Badoud 2015, 187 no. A 87.

l. 5–6: τοῦ γυμνασιάρχου καὶ ἀγωνοθέτου | τῶν ἱε-
ρῶν καὶ εἰσελαστικῶν τῶν μεγάλων | Ἀλείων ἀγῶνων
καὶ ἱερέως τοῦ Ἀλίου.

This list of public functions is unusual for Rhodian CVs insofar it uses nouns and not participles. Since it is very unlikely that the honorand was *gymnasiarchos*, *agonothetes* and priest of Halios all in one year, the syntax is probably a reflex of Latin usage.

25 Fragment of a statue base, Lindos, after 161 AD (?): Pugliese Carratelli 1955–1956, 168 no. 18. Cf. Badoud 2015, 140 n. 38 (for the date) and 238 no. 18.

— — — | [— — —] θεοῖς. | [ἐπ' ἱερέως τᾶς Ἀθάνας τᾶς
Λινδ]ίας (?) Μ(άρκου) Αὐρ(ηλίου) Ἀγήτορος β' καὶ ἐπὶ
γυμ[να]σιαρχοῦ τοῦ δεῖνος].

Badoud 2015, 140 n. 38 dates the base to ca. 141/142 AD, identifying the priest of Athena Lindia mentioned as the one honoured in IG XII, 1, 832 whose name was previously restored as [Πόπλιον Αἴ]λιον Ἀγήτορα β' (l. 1). Prosopographically, the identification seems plausible, and the restoration [Μάρκον Αὐρή]λιον fits the remains indicated in IG XII, 1, 382 should be disconnected from the great earthquake dated to 141/142 AD (for the date cf. Delrieux 2008, 220–221 with n. 72). Placing the fragmentary base in the later second or early third century AD would also put the secondary dating by a *gymnasiarchos* closer to the only other documented case of this practice in 26 (180 AD).

26 Monumental base for eight statues, Lindos, ca. 180 AD: Lindos II, 465. Cf. Robert 1966a, 84 n. 1; Badoud 2015, 187 no. A 87.

All statues were dedicated by the priest of Athana Lindia and of Zeus Polieus, the *mastroi* and the Lindians. They honour the *gymnasiarchos* himself (f, l. 3–8): Πόπλιον Αἴλιον Καλλίστρατον | τὸν καὶ Πλαγκιανὸν Ἀντιπά[τρου] Ἐρ(ειναῖ) τὸν δι' αἰῶνος φιλο[τειμ]ότατον ἐν τᾷ μεγάλῃ | πόλει Ῥόδῳ ἐπώνυμον | γυμνασίαρχον νεώτερον, his maternal grandfather (a), his wife (b), his mother (c), his father (d), his uncle (e), his fraternal grandmother (g) and his fraternal grandfather (h).

Base g, l. 5–13: ἐπαγγει[λα]μέ[ναν] μετὰ τοῦ υἱ[ο]ῦ αὐτᾶς τοῦ γυμνασιάρχ[ου] Πο. Αἴλ. | Θέωνος διὰ γρ[αμ]μάτων καὶ τᾷ μεγάλῃ π[ό]λει Ῥόδῳ | τὰν δι'

αἰῶνος ἐπώνυμον τοῦ προδηλ[ου]μέ|νου ἐκγόνου αὐτῶς
 γυμνασιαρχίαν κ[αί] ἱερεῦ|σι καὶ μαστρο[ί]ς καὶ Λιν-
 δίοις τὰς κατ' ἔτο[ς] νο|μὰς καὶ ἐλαιοθέσια ἰς αἰδίων
 μνάμαν [καί] ἐπώ|νυμον τειμάν τοῦ προγεγραμ(μ)ένο[υ]
 | Καλλιστράτου τοῦ καὶ Πλαγκιανοῦ. Cf. base e, l. 6–16.

Part i (set below the bases): [ἐπὶ γυμνασιάρχου νε-
 ωτέρου Ποπλίου Αἰλίου Καλλιστρ]άτου τοῦ καὶ Πλα-
 γκιανοῦ Ἀντιπάτρου Ἐρευναέως.

The uncle Publius A[elius] Theon, son of Zenodotos alias Theon, had also been *gymnasiarchos*, a fact only mentioned on the base of the statue of the grandmother Aelia Zenodote (g, l. 6). Since he is not called γυμνασι-
 αρχήσας, strictly he should have held the office at the time the bases were dedicated, resulting in a ‘family team’ of uncle and nephew officiating in both *gymnasiarchiai* in the same year. But the use of the noun could also be explained as resulting from Latin influence (cf. the comment on 24).

27 Graffito, Rhodos, undated: Pugliese Carratelli 1955–1956, 161 no. 15.

Face a, l. 1–6: ...ου Θεοδώρο[υ] | γυμνασιαρ-
 χή[σαντος (?)].

28 Fragment, Megiste, undated (based on Diamantaras’ rendering of the letters probably Hellenistic): Diamantaras 1894, 332 no. 19; Ashton 1995, 28 no. C 5.

--- | [---]ς γυμνασια[ρχ- ---] | ---.

The kind of monument the fragment belonged to cannot be determined, since the *editio princeps* offers no information beyond the letters themselves and the find-spot in a private house, and the stone itself seems to be lost. The remains can be restored either as a form of γυμνασιαρχήσας or one of γυμνασίαρχος, probably referring to a Rhodian *gymnasiarchos* since it is very unlikely that the small island had a *gymnasion* of its own and Megiste clearly belonged to Rhodes, being garrisoned in Hellenistic times (cf. Bresson 1999, 104–106). Since it is unclear what a *gymnasiarchos* would have been doing on the island, or why someone would have erected a monument with a CV there, one should consider that the fragment originated from Rhodes itself.

(b) The *gymnasion* in Rhodes

29 Decree regulating the furnishing of oil, Rhodos, first century AD: IG XII, 1, 3; SIG³ III, 974; Badoud 2015, 360–361 no. 17.

l. 1–4: τῶ[ν] | ἀνδρῶν, οἵτ]ινες θησεῦντι καὶ πωλη-
 σεῦντι τὸ ἔλαιον ἰς τ[ὸ] | γυμνάσιον ἀ]φθόνως καὶ ἀνε-
 πικωλύτως ποιούμενοι τὰν θέ[σιν] ἀ]φθόνως καὶ ἀνεπι-
 κωλύτως ποιούμενοι τὰν θέ[σιν] | ἀναγράφαι ὁ]πόσας
 κα ἕκαστοι λάχωντι ἀμέρας κτλ.

A day-by-day list of contributors deriving from this or a similar regulation is IG XII, 1, 4 (Badoud 2015, 361–366 no. 18).

30 Fragmentary regulations concerning the pentathlon, Rhodos (in the vicinity of the *gymnasion*), first century AD (?): Pugliese Carratelli 1952–1954a, 289–290 no. 65; Moretti 1956; SEG 15, 501.

Col. I, l. 18–20: [ἀγ]ωνοθε[ε] | [--- γυ]μνασι | [---].

The scant remains of the first column allow no certain restorations. In l. 19, supplementing a form of γυμνασίαρχος as well as one of γυμνάσιον would result in a word division not conforming to the syllabification usually employed in Greek inscriptions.

31 Fragment of an honorary decree, Rhodos, second century AD: Maiuri 1925, 6–7 no. 3.

l. 2–4: προνοησάμενον τὰς τοῦ γυμνα[σίου] ἐλαιο-
 θεσίας (?) ---] ἀκολουθῶς ταῖς θεῖαις νομοθεσίαι[ς] | ---.

The context cannot be restored with any certainty from the remains. Instead of τὰς τοῦ γυμνα[σίου] ἐλαιοθεσίας, one could consider either a genitive singular (with τῆς) or the supplement χρειᾶς, giving the passage a more general sense.

Appendix II: Dating IG XII, 1, 46 (11) and Maiuri 1925, 19–29 no. 18 (10)

A monument of special interest for the Rhodian *gymnasiarchiai* is IG XII, 1, 46 (11), a statue base for Asklepiadas, son of Andronikos, γυμνασίαρχος πρεσβύτερος κατὰ Ῥωμαῖα, that has recently been reedited and redated by Nathan Badoud (Badoud 2015, 399–404, no. 3). The inscription consists of four columns of names after a short dedicatory text already cited in Appendix I. Badoud 2015, 121 calculates ca. 446 names; the total is uncertain, as in the first column the beginnings of several lines are lost, and some of the extant endings may not belong to a patronymic, but to the name of a grandfather or an adoptive father, in which case the name would extend to two lines. Since the honorand was

gymnasiarchos presbyteros, it is generally assumed that the men listed were the *presbyteroi* (cf. Hiller von Gaertringen 1929, 351).

The dating to the first half of the first century BC proposed by Holleaux 1893, 173–175 (Holleaux 1938, 383–386) has been specified to ca. 70 BC based on prosopographical arguments by van Gelder in the commentary to GDI III, 1, 3791 (p. 457). Since according to the chronology established by Blinkenberg 1938, 25, the closest Rhomaia had been held in 69 BC, Benediktsson 1938 proposed dating the base to ca. 68 BC. Fraser 1953, 41 n. 3 summarized the discussion to “ca. 75 B.C.” while the text is dated to “ca. 75–68 B.C.” in SEG 53, 824. Nathan Badoud now dates it to 80 BC (Badoud 2015, 131–132; cf. Badoud 2010, 133, no. D 8, with 81 BC).

One important element of Badoud’s argumentation is that since a *gymnasiarchia* exercised κατὰ Ῥωμαῖα is not attested anywhere else, the festival must have been special. That is probably correct: not so much based on comparison with the single other *gymnasiarchos* attested as having officiated κατὰ μεγάλα Ἀλῆια, but because of the fact that while this addition can be found with a considerable number of other public functions, 11 provides the only instance where another festival is linked to an office in this way.³⁵ Badoud’s conclusion that these Rhomaia had an extraordinary status, prompted by the privileges awarded to Rhodes after the First Mithridatic War, is not implausible. But the chain of probabilities does not provide a firm base for the dating. Apart from the fact that Badoud’s date for the privileges in 82 BC, linked to Sulla’s return to Rome, might be a little early,³⁶ the Rhodians had many other occasions for celebrating their friendship with Rome in the following years, such as the Roman victory in the Third Mithridatic War or Pompey’s triumph over the pirates.

Badoud’s main line of argumentation is prosopographical. Here only a extensive analysis of the cata-

logue, which Badoud does not provide and which I cannot attempt here, will yield a definite result. I will explicate only one point arguing against Badoud’s date which is relevant in the context of the inscriptions discussed in this article:³⁷ Despite having been *gymnasiarchos presbyteros* himself, the honorand of 10, Polykles, is not mentioned in 11. Assuming that the catalogue in 11 names all *presbyteroi* alive or at least active when the statue was erected, the simplest explanation is that Polykles was already dead at this time.³⁸ Following Maiuri, Badoud dates 10 to ca. 80 BC, so that it could predate 11 slightly.³⁹ But this date is difficult to maintain: As mentioned above, Polykles reached the pinnacle of his political career during the First Mithridatic War (88–85 BC), and he held at least five public functions afterwards, one of them a posting as *trierarchos* in wartime (κατὰ πόλεμον: 10, l. 17). While dating this *trierarchia* to 85 BC is not impossible, it would mean that three of the functions mentioned before – a *phylarchia*, a command of a *tetrereis* Polykles had apparently not performed κατὰ πόλεμον, and a *choregia* (10, l. 14–16), each combined with a victory in a competition – have to be compressed into a period of just three years. Thus it seems more plausible that these activities should be dated after 85 BC and that the war mentioned was one of the Roman campaigns against ‘pirates’ between 78 and 67 BC or the Third Mithridatic War (74–63 BC). This would date Polykles’ statue to ca. 70 BC, arguing that if 11 is to be dated at least a short time later, one should reconsider the proposal made by van Gelder and Benediktsson.

35 Cf. p. 2.

36 Badoud 2015, 132. A Rhodian embassy to the senate including the orator Apollonios Molon and pleading for a reward for the Rhodians’ assistance against Mithridates is placed by Cicero shortly before his defence of Sex. Roscius in the year 80 BC (Cic. Brut. 90 [312]: *eodem tempore Moloni dedimus operam; dictatore enim Sulla legatus ad senatum de Rhodiorum praemiis venerat*). Accordingly, Schmitt 1957, 182 dates the visit to 81 BC, but it might have been even later. Therefore, it is not certain that the Roman decision was made soon enough for the Rhodians to turn the Rhomaia of 80 BC into a special event.

37 There is one additional basic point of criticism: A cornerstone of Badoud’s prosopographical reasoning, also employed by others (cf.

Benediktsson 1938), is the mentioning respectively omission of an adoption in the name formulae used in 11 and parallel texts obviously recording the same person. Yet as it is at least possible that an adoption could be omitted in certain documents because it was regarded as inconsequential in the context (I. Lindos I, col. 96 n. 1; Fraser 1953, 31; Poma 1972, 197–198; Gabrielsen 1997, 198 n. 5), there needs to be a broader discussion as to the validity of this argument.

38 Of course there is the possibility that members of the *presbyteroi* had abstained from participating in the honours for Andronikos for personal or political reasons. But this seems rather unlikely.

39 Maiuri 1925, 22; Badoud 2015, 210, no. 122.

Appendix III: I. Lindos II, 482 (23)

The office of *gymnasiarchos* is mentioned twice in a part of a CV on a fragmentary statue base found on the acropolis of Lindos and published by Christian Blinkenberg as I. Lindos II, 482. The inscription has now been dated by Nathan Badoud to the middle of the second century AD (Badoud 2015, 237 no. 841). With the correction proposed by Badoud 2015, 186 n. 429 the text reads as follows:

 [τ]ᾱς Ἀθῆ[νας τ]ᾱς ἐν Ἀχαΐα πόλ[ει,
 δαμιουργήσαν]-
 τα τᾷ ἐν Καμίρῳ Ἑστίᾳ καὶ τῷ Διὶ τ[ῷ Τελείῳ, ιε-
 ρατεύσαντα]
 τοῦ προπάτορος Ἀλίου κατὰ τὸ ἄ[στυ καὶ Δαμα]-
 4 γόραν δ' γυμνασίαρχον νεώτερον κατὰ τὸν
 ἐνιαυ]-
 τὸν τᾷς τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ἱερωσύν[ας Ἀθάνας
 Πολι]-
 ἄδος καὶ Διὸς Πολιέως καὶ Ἡρακλ[εῦς, -----
 - -]-
 τα, ἀγεμονεύσαντα τᾷς χώρας, ἱερ[οταμιεύ-
 σαντα],
 8 χρεοφυλακήσαντα, γυμ[μ]νασιαρχή[σαντα,
 γραμμα]-
 τεύσαντα βουλᾶς, ταμιεύσαν[τα, πρυτανεύ]-
 σαντα, ἀγωνοθετήσαντα Ῥω[μαίων, πρεσ]-
 βεύσαντα ποτὶ τε τοὺς Ἀψ[τοκράτορας καὶ ἐν]
 12 προῖσ[φο]ραῖς μείζ[ο]σι γενόμενον -----]

3-4 Badoud: κατα το α[- - - και - -] | γοραν Δ I. Lindos 8 γυννασιαρχη lap. 10 Ρω[- - - I. Lindos 12 μείζω lap.

The inscription honoured a man called Damagoras (for the identification cf. Badoud 2015, 186 no. A 83) who had held a number of Rhodian priesthoods (l. 1-7) and other public offices (l. 7-12). Blinkenberg's reconstruction of the text should be reviewed, the first and most obvious problem being that, in its restored form, line 2 is considerably longer than the other lines. Since the restoration of this line is without alternative (sup-

plementing the shorter *ιερέα* instead of *ιερατεύσαντα* does not conform to the list of participles), one should consider that the other supplements are too short. Further arguments for this proposition are: (1) In l. 4 γυμνασίαρχον should be complemented by γενόμενον. (2) The *gymnasiarchia* of the younger Damagoras must have been dated by his father's eponymous priesthood of Halios mentioned in l. 3-4. Therefore, the priestships following τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ἱερωσύν[ας in l. 5 should be preceded by *ιερατεύσαντα*. (3) After πρεσ[β]εύσαντα ποτὶ τε τοὺς Ἀψ[τοκράτορας in l. 11 (if the reading qualified by Blinkenberg as "très douteuse" is correct) a second destination of the honorand's embassies must be added.⁴⁰

Without having the space to go into further detail, I propose the following preliminary restoration:

 [τ]ᾱς Ἀθῆ[νας τ]ᾱς ἐν Ἀχαΐα πόλ[ει, - - - -
 δαμιουργήσαν]-
 τα τᾷ ἐν Καμίρῳ Ἑστίᾳ καὶ τῷ Διὶ τ[ῷ Τελείῳ, ιε-
 ρατεύσαντα]
 τοῦ προπάτορος Ἀλίου κατὰ τὸ ἄ[στυ, τὸν υἱὸν
 αὐτοῦ Δαμα]-
 4 γόραν δ' γυμνασίαρχον νεώτερον γενόμενον
 κατὰ τὸν ἐνιαυ]-
 τὸν τᾷς τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ἱερωσύν[ας, ιερα-
 τεύσαντα Ἀθάνας Πολι]-
 ἄδος καὶ Διὸς Πολιέως καὶ Ἡρακλ[εῦς - - - - -
 - - - - -]-
 τα, ἀγεμονεύσαντα τᾷς χώρας, ἱερ[οταμιεύ-
 σαντα, - - - -],
 8 χρεοφυλακήσαντα, γυμ[μ]νασιαρχή[σαντα πρε-
 σβύτερον, γραμμα]-
 τεύσαντα βουλᾶς, ταμιεύσαν[τα, στραταγήσα-
 ντα, πρυτανεύ]-
 σαντα, ἀγωνοθετήσαντα Ῥω[μαίων, - - - - -
 - - - -, πρεσ]-
 βεύσαντα ποτὶ τε τοὺς Ἀψ[τοκράτορας καὶ ποτὶ
 ἀνθυπάτους, ἐν]
 12 προῖσ[φο]ραῖς μείζ[ο]σι γενόμενον -----]

40 Cf. 21, l. 9-12: πρεσβεύσαντα πλεονάκ[ις ἰς Ῥώμαν | πο]τὶ [τ]ε τοὺς Σε-
 βαστοὺς καὶ ποτὶ ἀνθ[υ]πάτους καὶ | ποτὶ ἐπι[τ]ρόπους.

4 νεώτερ[ον or νεωτέρ[ων 8 πρεσβύτερον or πρεσβυτέρων.

For ἀγωνοθετήσαντα Ῥωμαίων in l. 10 cf. SEG 39, 749 (Kontorini 1989a, 145–148 no. 62; cf. Badoud 2015, 187 no. A 90), l. 1–3: ἱερεὺς Ἡλίου καὶ ἀγ[ω]νοθέτης τοῦ ἀγῶνος | τῶν Ῥωμαίων. The oddity that the son's office is inserted into the father's CV retaining the accusative of the main list (instead of using a *genitivus absolutus*, for instance) remains, but I do not see how this could be solved in any case. Otherwise, the inscription contains a typical Rhodian CV listing a *gymnasiarchia*, with all probability that of the *presbyteroi*, alongside other public functions.

Appendix IV: The *gymnasiarchia* of Nisyros

In addition to the evidence for the *gymnasiarchiai* of Rhodes proper, there is one inscription mentioning a *gymnasiarchos* active on Nisyros. Situated north-west of Rhodes, the island had been incorporated into the *polis* of Rhodes probably at the very end of the third century BC, forming a *damos* of its own. A CV inscription on a statue base dated to the first century AD documents that the honorand, a member of the local *damos*, had served in the (Rhodian) navy, had been crowned several times

by the council (of Rhodes), had been priest of the Emperors in Nisyros, *damiourgos* and *gymnasiarchos* in Nisyros and had distributed oil for 13 months. Since it is evident from the text that the *gymnasiarchia* is a local institution and not one of Rhodes, I did not include it in the catalogue in Appendix I.⁴¹

The inscription is the sole evidence for a *gymnasiarchia* on Nisyros or one of the other islands belonging to the Rhodian state (cf. the commentary to 28). As far as I know, there is no archaeological record of a *gymnasion* on Nisyros (or, for that matter, for a temple of a local Imperial cult). Based on this scant evidence, there is no way to determine whether the *gymnasiarchia* was a relic from the independent *polis* of Nisyros of the third century BC or, like the imperial cult, a new development of the first century AD. The CV itself reveals a special position of Nisyros: Following the Rhodian model in its overall arrangement, it offers some apparently local variations, one of them in the description of the distribution of oil: The text from Nisyros has θέντα τὸ ἔλαιον, whereas the Rhodian inscriptions use ποιησάμενος τὰν θέσιν τοῦ ἐλαίου, and there is no parallel text from Rhodes where the recipients of the distribution are named, much less enumerated as distinct groups (cf. the evidence discussed in note 21).⁴²

41 IG XII, 3, 104, l. 1–11: Γνωμαγόραν Δωροθέου | Νεισύριον | στρατευσάμενον ἐν τριημιολίᾳ, ἧ ὁνομα Εὐανδρία Σεβαστά, καὶ στεφανωθέντα ὑπὸ τὰν βουλᾶν πλεονάκις χρυσέοις στεφάνοις καὶ ἱερατεύσαντα ἐν Νισύρῳ τῶν Σεβαστῶν καὶ δαμιουργήσαντα καὶ | γυμνασιαρχήσαντα{ν} ἐν Νισύρῳ καὶ θέντα τὸ ἔλαιον πᾶσι ἐλευθέροις καὶ τοῖς κατοικοῦσι ἐν Νεισύρῳ καὶ τοῖς παρεπιδαμεῦσιν ἐπὶ μῆνες (l. μῆνας) ιγ'. For the historical evidence for Nisyros as a part of Rhodos see Pa-

pachristodoulou 1989, 47.

42 The other variation is the description of the honorand's merits concerning the local associations heading the otherwise conventional list of honours awarded by associations at the end of the CV (l. 11–12: γενόμενον εὐάρεστον πᾶσι τοῖς κοινείοις τοῖς ἐν Νισύρῳ), the term *κοινεῖον* being a synonym for *κοινόν* rarely found in inscriptions generally and never on Rhodes.

		line
honorand	[Damagoras, son of Damagoras, grandson of Damagoras]	
dedicant(s)	---	
priesthoods	[priest] of Athana in <i>Achaia polis</i> (Ialysos)	1
	[<i>damiourgos</i>] to Hestia and Zeus [Teleios] in Kamiros	1–2
	[priest] of the Halios in the city	2–3
	[his son Dama]goras [being] <i>gymnasiarchos neoterios</i> (or of the <i>neoterioi</i>)	
	in the year of his father's (eponymous) priesthood	3–5
	priest of Athana Polias, Zeus Polieus and Herakles	5–6
	---	6–7
	commander of the territory (ἀγεμὼν τᾶς χώρας)	7
	temple-treasurer (ιεροταμίας)	7
	---	7
public offices and functions	superintendent of the archive (<i>chreophylax</i>)	8
	<i>gymnasiarchos</i> [<i>presbyteros</i> (or of the <i>presbyteroi</i>)]	8
	secretary of the council (γραμματεὺς βουλᾶς)	8–9
	treasurer (<i>tamias</i>)	9
	[<i>strategos</i>]	9
	[<i>prytanis</i>]	9–10
	<i>agonothetes</i> of the <i>Rhomaia</i>	10
	---	10
	ambassador to emperors as well as [to governors]	10–11
	participating in major <i>proeisphorai</i>	11–12

Tab. 6 CV in I. Lindos II 482 (23).

		line
honorand	Gnomagoras, son of Dorotheos, from the <i>damos</i> Nisyrioi	1–2
public offices, functions and honours	military service on the <i>tribemiolia</i> named Euandria Sebasta	2–3
	crowned several times by the (Rhodian) councils	3–5
	priest of the imperial cult in Nisyros	5–6
	<i>damiourgos</i>	6
	<i>gymnasiarchos</i> in Nisyros and distributing oil for 13 months	6–11

Tab. 7 CV in IG XII 3, 104.

Bibliography

Arnold 1936

Irene Ringwood Arnold. "Festivals of Rhodes". *American Journal of Archaeology* 40 (1936), 432–436.

Ashton 1995

Norman G. Ashton. *Ancient Megisti. The Forgotten Kastellorizo*. Nedlands: University of Western Australia Press, 1995.

Badoud 2010

Nathan Badoud. "Une famille de bronziers originaire de Tyr". *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 172 (2010), 125–143.

Badoud 2015

Nathan Badoud. *Le Temps de Rhodes. Une chronologie des inscriptions de la cité fondée sur l'étude de ses institutions*. Vestigia 63. Munich: C. H. Beck, 2015.

Benediktsson 1938

Jakob Benediktsson. "Sur la date de IG XII 1,46". In *Deux documents chronologiques rhodiens*. Ed. by C. Blinkenberg. Lindiaka 8/ Archæologisk-kunsthistoriske Meddelelser 2.4. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1938, 27–28.

Blinkenberg 1938

Christian Blinkenberg. *Deux documents chronologiques rhodiens*. Lindiaka 8/ Archæologisk-kunsthistoriske Meddelelser 2.4. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1938.

Blümel 1991

Wolfgang Blümel. *Die Inschriften der rhodischen Peraia*. In: *Inschriften Griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien* 38. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1991.

Bresson 1991

Alain Bresson. *Recueil des inscriptions de la Pérée rhodienne (Pérée intégrée)*. Centre de Recherches d'Histoire Ancienne 105. Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Besançon 445. Paris: Université de Besançon, 1991.

Bresson 1999

Alain Bresson. "Rhodes and Lycia in Hellenistic Times". In *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture, and Society*. Ed. by V. Gabrielsen, P. Bilde, and T. Engberg-Pedersen. Studies in Hellenistic Civilization 9. Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag, 1999, 98–131.

Bresson 2004

Alain Bresson. "Dédicaces de Lindos et de Rhodes pour Titus Flavius Aglôchartos". In *L'hellénisme de l'époque romaine: Nouveaux documents, nouvelles approches (Ier s. a. C. – IIIe s. p. C.)*. Actes du Colloque international à la mémoire de Louis Robert, Paris, 7–8 juillet 2000. Ed. by S. Follet. Paris: De Boccard, 2004, 225–232.

Bresson, Brun, and Varinlioglu 2001

Alain Bresson, Patrice Brun, and Ender Varinlioglu. "Les inscriptions grecques et latines". In *Les hautes terres de Carie*. Ed. by P. Debord and E. Varinlioglu. Ausonius Publications. Mémoires 4. Bordeaux: Ausonius, 2001, 81–305.

Bringmann 2002

Klaus Bringmann. "Rhodos als Bildungszentrum der hellenistischen Welt". *Chiron* 32 (2002), 65–81.

Cassayre 2010

Aude Cassayre. *La Justice dans les cités grecques. De la formation des royaumes hellénistiques au legs d'Attale*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2010.

Chankowski 2010

Andrzej S. Chankowski. *L'éphébie hellénistique. Étude d'une institution civique dans les cités grecques des îles de la Mer Égée et de l'Asie Mineure*. Culture et Cité 4. Paris: De Boccard, 2010.

M. Chaviaras and N. D. Chaviaras 1907

Michael Chaviaras and Niketas D. Chaviaras. "Ἀνέκδοτοι ἐπιγραφαὶ Περαίας τῶν Ῥοδίων". *Archaiologikē ephēmeris* (1907), 209–218.

Coqueugniot 2013

Gaëlle Coqueugniot. *Archives et bibliothèques dans le monde grec. Édifices et organisation. Ve siècle avant notre ère – IIe siècle de notre ère*. BAR International Series 2536. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2013.

Cordiano 1997

Giuseppe Cordiano. *La ginnasiarchia nelle 'πόλεις' dell'occidente mediterraneo antico*. Studi e testi di storia antica 7. Pisa: ETS, 1997.

Curty 2009

O. Curty. "Introduction". In *L'huile et l'argent. Gymnasiarchie et évergétisme dans la Grèce hellénistique*. Actes du colloque tenu à Fribourg du 13 au 15 octobre 2005, publiés en l'honneur du Prof. Marcel Piérart à l'occasion de son 60ème anniversaire. Ed. by O. Curty, S. Piccand, and S. Codouey. Fribourg: Séminaire d'histoire ancienne de l'Université de Fribourg, 2009, 1–7.

Curty, Piccand, and Codouey 2009

O. Curty, S. Piccand, and S. Codouey, eds. *L'huile et l'argent. Gymnasiarchie et évergétisme dans la Grèce hellénistique*. Actes du colloque tenu à Fribourg du 13 au 15 octobre 2005, publiés en l'honneur du Prof. Marcel Piérart à l'occasion de son 60ème anniversaire. Fribourg: Séminaire d'histoire ancienne de l'Université de Fribourg, 2009.

Curty 2015

Olivier Curty. *Gymnasiarchika. Recueil et analyse des inscriptions de l'époque hellénistique en l'honneur des gymnasiarques*. Paris: De Boccard, 2015.

Delorme 1960

Jean Delorme. *Γυμνάσιον. Étude sur les monuments consacrés à l'éducation en Grèce (des origines à l'Empire romain)*. Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 196. Paris: De Boccard, 1960.

Delrieux 2008

Fabrice Delrieux. *Les monnaies des cités grecques de la basse vallée de Harpasos en Carie (IIe siècle a.C. – IIIe siècle p.C.)* Numismatica anatolica 3. Bordeaux: Ausonius, 2008.

Diamantaras 1894

Achil. S. Diamantaras. “Επιγραφαὶ ἐκ Λυκίας”. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 18 (1894), 323–333.

Dreliosi-Iraklidou 2014

Anastasia Dreliosi-Iraklidou. “Μαρτυρίες από τη φιλολογική παράδοση και τα αρχαιολογικά ευρήματα για την παιδεία και την πνευματική καλλιέργεια στην αρχαία Ρόδο”. In *Σοφία ἄδολες. Τιμητικός τόμος για τον Ιωάννη Χρ. Παπαχριστοδούλου*. Rhodes: Υπουργείο Πολιτισμού και Αθλητισμού. Αρχαιολογικό Ινστιτούτο Αιγαϊακών Σπουδών, 2014, 37–63.

Dreyer 2004

Boris Dreyer. “Die Neoi im hellenistischen Gymnasion”. In *Das hellenistische Gymnasion*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel 8. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 211–236.

Duploux 2013

Alain Duploux. “Les Mille de Colophon. ‘Totalité symbolique’ d’une cité d’Ionie (VIe–IIe s. av. J.-C.)”. *Historia* 62 (2013), 146–166.

Fabiani 2012

Roberta Fabiani. “Dedochthai tei boulei kai toi demoï: protagonisti e prassi della procedura deliberativa a Iasos”. In *‘Demokratie’ im Hellenismus. Von der Herrschaft des Volkes zur Herrschaft der Honoratioren?* Ed. by C. Mann and P. Scholz. Die hellenistische Polis als Lebensform 2. Mainz: Verlag Antike, 2012, 109–165.

Fagan 1999

Garrett G. Fagan. “Gifts of *gymnasia*: a Test Case for Reading Quasi-Technical Jargon in Latin Inscriptions”. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 124 (1999), 263–275.

Filimonos 1989

Melina Filimonos. “Ένα νέο γυμνάσιο στη Ρόδο καὶ ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Διοδώρου, XX, 100, 3–4. Μέρος πρώτο: τό γυμνάσιο”. *L’antiquité classique* 58 (1989), 128–156, pl. 1–13.

Forbes 1933

Clarence Allen Forbes. *Neoi. A Contribution to the Study of Greek Associations*. Philological Monographs 2. Middletown, CT: The American Philological Association, 1933.

Fraser 1953

Peter M. Fraser. “The Tribal-Cycles of Eponymous Priests at Lindos and Kamiros”. *Eranos* 51 (1953), 23–47.

Fröhlich 2004

Pierre Fröhlich. *Les cités grecques et le contrôle des magistrats (IVe–Ier siècle avant J.-C.)* Hautes études du monde gréco-romain 33. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2004.

Fröhlich 2009

Pierre Fröhlich. “Les activités évergétiques des gymnasiarques à l’époque hellénistique tardive: la fourniture de l’huile”. In *L’huile et l’argent. Gymnasiarchie et évergétisme dans la Grèce hellénistique. Actes du colloque tenu à Fribourg du 13 au 15 octobre 2005, publiés en l’honneur du Prof. Marcel Piérart à l’occasion de son 60ème anniversaire*. Ed. by O. Curty, S. Piccard, and S. Codouey. Fribourg: Séminaire d’histoire ancienne de l’Université de Fribourg, 2009, 57–94.

Fröhlich 2013

Pierre Fröhlich. “Les groupes du gymnase d’Iasos et les presbytéroï dans les cités à l’époque hellénistique”. In *Groupes et associations dans les cités grecques (IIIe siècle av. J.-C.–IIe siècle apr. J.-C.)*. *Actes de la table ronde de Paris, INHA, 19–20 juin 2009*. Ed. by P. Fröhlich and P. Hamon. Hautes études du monde gréco-romain 49. Geneva: Droz, 2013, 159–211.

Gabrielsen 1997

Vincent Gabrielsen. *The Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes*. Studies in Hellenistic Civilization 6. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1997.

Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993

Ph. Gauthier and M. B. Hatzopoulos. *La loi gymnasiarchique de Béroia*. Μελετήματα 16. Athens: Κέντρον Ἑλληνικῆς καὶ Ρωμαϊκῆς Αρχαιότητος τοῦ Ἑθνικοῦ Ἰδρύματος Ἑρευνῶν, 1993.

Gauthier 1985

Philippe Gauthier. *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs (VIe–Ier siècle avant J.-C.)*. *Contribution à l’histoire des institutions*. Bulletin de correspondance hellénique. Supplément 12. Paris: École Française d’Athènes, 1985.

Gauthier 1995

Philippe Gauthier. “Notes sur le rôle du gymnase dans les cités hellénistiques”. In *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus. Kolloquium, München, 24. bis 26. Juli 1993*. Ed. by M. Wörrle and P. Zanker. Vestigia 47. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995, 1–11.

Gauthier 2010

Philippe Gauthier. “Note on the Role of the Gymnasion in the Hellenistic City”. In *Greek Athletics*. Ed. by J. König. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010, 87–101.

Gauthier 2011

Philippe Gauthier. *Études d’histoire et d’institutions grecques. Choix d’écrits*. Ed. by D. Rousset. Hautes études du monde gréco-romain 47. Geneva: Droz, 2011.

Grieb 2008

Volker Grieb. *Hellenistische Demokratie. Politische Organisation und Struktur in freien griechischen Poleis nach Alexander dem Großen*. Historia Einzelschriften 199. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2008.

Habicht 1990

Christian Habicht. “Ein kaiserzeitliches Familiendenkmal aus Lindos”. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 84 (1990), 113–120.

Hamon 2005

Patrice Hamon. "Le Conseil et la participation des citoyens: les mutations de la basse époque hellénistique". In *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique*. Ed. by P. Fröhlich and C. Müller. Hautes études du monde gréco-romain 17. Geneva: Droz, 2005, 121–144.

Hamon 2007

Patrice Hamon. "Élites dirigeantes et processus d'aristocratisation à l'époque hellénistique". In *Aristocratie antique. Modèles et exemplarité sociale. Actes de la Journée d'étude de Dijon, 25 novembre 2005*. Ed. by H.-L. Fernoux and C. Stein. Dijon: Éditions Universitaires de Dijon de l'Université de Bourgogne, 2007, 79–100.

Hansen 1980

Mogens Herman Hansen. "Seven Hundred Archai in Classical Athens". *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 21 (1980), 151–173.

Hiller von Gaertringen 1894

Friedrich Hiller von Gaertringen. "Die Zeitbestimmung der rhodischen Künstlerinschriften". *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 9 (1894), 23–43.

Hiller von Gaertringen 1929

Friedrich Hiller von Gaertringen. "Rhodische Priesterlisten und Feste". *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 27 (1929), 349–354.

Hin 2007

Saskia Hin. "Class and Society in the Cities of the Greek East. Education during the Ephebeia". *Ancient Society* 37 (2007), 141–166.

Hoepfner 2002

Wolfram Hoepfner. "Pergamon – Rhodos – Nysa – Athen. Bibliotheken in Gymnasien und anderen Lehr- und Forschungsstätten". In *Antike Bibliotheken*. Ed. by W. Hoepfner. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2002, 67–85 and 133.

Holleaux 1893

Maurice Holleaux. "Sur la chronologie des inscriptions rhodiennes". *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* N.S. 17 (1893), 171–185.

Holleaux 1938

Maurice Holleaux. *Études d'épigraphie et histoire grecques I*. Paris: De Boccard, 1938.

Jacopi 1932a

Giulio Jacopi. "Il tempio e il teatro di Apollo Eretimio". *Clara Rhodos* 2 (1932), 77–116.

Jacopi 1932b

Giulio Jacopi. "Nuove epigrafi dalle Sporadi meridionali". *Clara Rhodos* 2 (1932), 165–255.

Kah 2014

Daniel Kah. "Demokratie in der Kleinstadt. Überlegungen zu Demographie und Partizipation am Beispiel des hellenistischen Priene". In *Stadtkultur im Hellenismus*. Ed. by A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann. Die hellenistische Polis als Lebensform 4. Heidelberg: Verlag Antike, 2014, 148–172.

Kah 2016

Daniel Kah. "Rhodos als Seemacht". In *Seemacht, Seeberrschaft und die Antike*. Ed. by E. Baltrusch, H. Kopp, and C. Wendt. Historia Einzelschriften 244. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2016, 253–277.

Kah 2017

Daniel Kah. "Review of Olivier Curty, *Gymnasiarchika*. Recueil et analyse des inscriptions de l'époque hellénistique en l'honneur des gymnasiarques, Paris 2015". *Historische Zeitschrift* 304 (2017), 457–458.

Kah and Scholz 2004

Daniel Kah and Peter Scholz, eds. *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*. Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel 8. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004.

Kennell 2013

Nigel M. Kennell. "Who Were the Neoi?" In *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-Classical Polis. Fourth Century BC to Second Century AD*. Ed. by P. Martzavou and N. Papazarkadas. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013, 217–232.

Knoepfler 1979

Denis Knoepfler. "Contributions à l'épigraphie de Chalcis II. Les couronnes de Théoklès, fils de Pausanias". *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 103 (1979), 165–188.

Kondis 1952

Ioannis D. Kondis. "Ἀνασκαφικαὶ ἐρευναι εἰς τὴν πόλιν τῆς Ῥόδου (II)". *Πρακτικά της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας* (1952), 547–591.

Konstantinopoulos 1964

Gregor Konstantinopoulos. "Επιγραφὰὶ ἐκ Ῥόδου". *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον* A 18 (1964), 1–36, 170, pl. 1–16.

Kontorini 1975

Vassa Kontorini. "Les concours des grands Éréthimia à Rhodes". *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 99 (1975), 97–117.

Kontorini 1983

Vassa Kontorini. *Inscriptions inédites relatives à l'histoire et aux cultes de Rhodes au IIe et au Ier s. av. J.-C. Rhodiaka I*. Archaeologia Transatlantica 6. Publications d'histoire et de l'art et d'archéologie de l'Université Catholique de Louvain 42. Louvain-la-Neuve and Providence, RI: Institut supérieur d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'art, Collège Erasme, 1983.

Kontorini 1989a

Vassa Kontorini. *Ἀνέκδοτες ἐπίγραφες Ῥόδου II*. *Inscriptions inédites de Rhodes II*. Athens: Ινστιτούτο του βιβλίου. Εκδόσεις Καρσαμίτσα, 1989.

Kontorini 1989b

Vassa Kontorini. "Ἐνα νέο γυμνάσιο στὴ Ῥόδο καὶ ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Διοδώρου, XX, 100, 3–4. Μέρος δεύτερο: οἱ ἐπιγραφές". *L'antiquité classique* 58 (1989), 157–177, pl. I–III.

Kontorini 1993

Vassa Kontorini. "La famille de l'amiral Damagoras de Rhodes. Contribution à la prosopographie et à l'histoire rhodiennes au Ier s. av. J.C." *Chiron* 23 (1993), 83–99.

Lafer 2013

Renate Lafer. "Zum Begriff *gymnasium* in den Inschriften der nordafrikanischen römischen Provinzen". In *Kultur(en) – Formen des Alltäglichen in der Antike. Festschrift für Ingomar Weiler zum 75. Geburtstag*. Ed. by P. Mauritsch and C. Ulf. Universität Graz, Allgemeine wissenschaftliche Reihe 33; Nummi et Litterae 7. Graz: Leykam Verlag, 2013, 59–67.

Laum 1914

Bernhard Laum. *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike. Ein Beitrag zur antiken Kulturgeschichte*. Berlin: Teubner, 1914.

Laurenzi 1938

Luciano Laurenzi. "I monumenti dell'antica Rodi. Prima relazione sugli scavi e sui restauri". *Memorie pubblicate a cura dell'Istituto storico-archeologico F.E.R.T. e della R. Deputazione di storia patria per Rodi* 2 (1938), 25–29, 146, pl. XVI–XXVI.

Ma 2013

John Ma. *Statues and Cities. Honorific Portraits and Civic Identity in the Hellenistic World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Maillot 2009

Stéphanie Maillot. "Une association de sculpteurs à Rhodes au II^e siècle av. J.-C.: un cercle d'intégration à la société rhodienne". In *Chemin faisant. Mythes, cultes et société en Grèce ancienne. Mélanges en l'honneur de Pierre Brulé*. Ed. by L. Bodiou, V. Mehl, J. Oulhen, F. Prost, and J. Wilgaux. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2009, 39–58.

Maiuri 1916

Amedeo Maiuri. "Nuove iscrizioni greche dalle Sporadi meridionali I. Iscrizioni del Museo Archeologico di Rodi". *Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni italiane in Oriente* 2 (1916), 133–179.

Maiuri 1925

Amedeo Maiuri. *Nuova silloge epigrafica di Rodi e Cos*. Florence: F. Le Monnier, 1925.

Mitford 1960

Terence Bruce Mitford. "Ptolemy Son of Pelops". *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 46 (1960), 109–111.

Morelli 1959

Donato Morelli. *I Culti in Rodi*. Studi classici e orientali 8. Pisa: Libreria Gollardica Editrice, 1959.

Moretti 1956

Luigi Moretti. "Un regolamento rodio per la gara del pentatlo". *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 84 (1956), 55–60.

O'Neill 1981

James L. O'Neill. "How Democratic was Hellenistic Rhodes?". *Athenaeum* N.S. 59 (1981), 468–473.

Oehler 1924

Johann Oehler. "Λαμπισαρχία". *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 12. 1 (1924), 567–568.

Papachristodoulou 1986

Ioannis Ch. Papachristodoulou. "Νέα στοιχεία για βιβλιοθήκες στην αρχαία Ρόδο. Έπιγραφή σχετική με τη βιβλιοθήκη του άρχ. Γυμνασίου". *Δωδεκανησιακά Χρονικά* 11 (1986), 265–271.

Papachristodoulou 1989

Ioannis Ch. Papachristodoulou. *Οι αρχαίοι ροδιακοί δήμοι. Ιστορική Έπισκοπήση – Η Ίαλυσία*. Βιβλιοθήκη της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας 110. Athens: Η εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία, 1989.

Papachristodoulou 1990

Ioannis Ch. Papachristodoulou. "Das hellenistische Gymnasium von Rhodos. Neues zu seiner Bibliothek". In *Akten des XIII. Internationalen Kongresses für Klassische Archäologie, Berlin 1988*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1990, 500–501, pl. 75.3–4.

Poma 1972

Gabriella Poma. "Ricerche sull'adozione nel mondo rodio (III sec. a. C. / III sec. d. C.)". *Epigraphica* 34 (1972), 169–305.

Pugliese Carratelli 1953

Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli. "Sui damoi e le phylai di Rodi". *Studi classici e orientali* 2 (1953), 69–78.

Pugliese Carratelli 1939–1940

Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli. "Per la storia delle associazioni in Rodi antica". *Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni italiane in Oriente* 17/18, N.S. 1/2 (1939–1940), 147–200, pl. VI–XVIII.

Pugliese Carratelli 1952–1954a

Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli. "Supplemento epigrafico rodio". *Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni italiane in Oriente* 30–32, N.S. 14–16 (1952–1954), 247–316.

Pugliese Carratelli 1952–1954b

Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli. "Tituli Camirenses. Supplementum". *Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni italiane in Oriente* 30–32, N.S. 14–16 (1952–1954), 211–246.

Pugliese Carratelli 1955–1956

Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli. "Nuovo supplemento epigrafico rodio". *Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni italiane in Oriente* 33/34, N.S. 17/18 (1955–1956), 157–181.

Quaß 1993

Friedemann Quaß. *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens. Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Entwicklung in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1993.

Robert 1937

Louis Robert. *Études anatoliennes. Recherches sur les inscriptions grecques de l'Asie Mineure*. Études Orientales publiées par l'Institut Français d'Archéologie de Stamboul 5. Paris: De Boccard, 1937.

Robert 1939

Louis Robert. "Inscriptions grecques de Phénicie et d'Arabie". In *Mélanges syriens offerts à Monsieur René Dussaud, secrétaire perpétuel de l'Académie des Inscriptions et des Belles-Lettres, par ses amis et ses élèves*. Vol. 2. Bibliothèque archéologique et historique 30. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1939, 729–738.

Robert 1943

Louis Robert. "Voyages épigraphiques en Asie Mineure". *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 69, III 17 (1943), 170–201.

Robert 1960

Louis Robert. "Recherches épigraphiques". *Revue des études anciennes* 62 (1960), 276–361.

Robert 1966a

Louis Robert. *Documents de l'Asie Mineure méridionale. Inscriptions, monnaies et géographie*. Hautes études du monde gréco-romain 2. Geneva and Paris: Droz, 1966.

Robert 1966b

Louis Robert. "Inscriptions d'Aphrodisias". *L'antiquité classique* 35 (1966), 377–432, pl. I–II.

Robert 1969

Louis Robert. *Opera Minora Selecta. Épigraphie et antiquités grecques I–III*. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1969.

Robert 1989

Louis Robert. *Opera Minora Selecta. Épigraphie et antiquités grecques VI*. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1989.

Robert 2007

Louis Robert. *Choix d'écrits*. Ed. by D. Rousset, P. Gauthier, and I. Savalli-Lestrade. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2007.

Rosamilia 2014

Emilio Rosamilia. "Biblioteca a Rodi all'epoca di Timachidas". *Annali della Scuola normale superiore di Pisa* V 6 (2014), 325–362, 534–535.

Schmitt 1957

Hatto H. Schmitt. *Rom und Rhodos. Geschichte der politischen Beziehungen seit der ersten Berührung bis zum Aufgehen des Inselstaates im römischen Weltreich*. Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 40. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1957.

Scholz 2015

Peter Scholz. "Die Gymnasiarchie in hellenistischer Zeit und in der Kaiserzeit – Eine kurze Skizze der Entwicklung des leiturgischen Amtes". In *Das kaiserzeitliche Gymnasium*. Ed. by P. Scholz and D. Wiegandt. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2015, 79–96.

Scholz 2017

Peter Scholz. "Ein Ort bürgerlicher Mühe und Muße. Formen und Funktionen der Institution des griechischen Gymnasiums im historischen Wandel". In *Sophisten in Hellenismus und Kaiserzeit. Orte, Methoden und Personen der Bildungsvermittlung*. Ed. by B. Wyss, R. Hirsch-Luipold, and S.-J. Hirschi. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 101. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017, 11–25.

Scholz and Wiegandt 2015

Peter Scholz and Dirk Wiegandt, eds. *Das kaiserzeitliche Gymnasium*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2015.

Schuler 2004

Christof Schuler. "Die Gymnasiarchie in hellenistischer Zeit". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel 8. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 163–192.

Segre 1935

Mario Segre. "Epigraphica". *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 63, N.S. 13 (1935), 214–225.

Segre and Pugliese Carratell 1949–1951

Marius Segre and Giovanni Pugliese Carratell. "Tituli Camirenses". *Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni italiane in Oriente* 27–29, N.S. 11–13 (1949–1951), 141–318.

Sielhorst 2015

Barbara Sielhorst. *Hellenistische Agorai. Gestaltung, Rezeption und Semantik eines urbanen Raumes*. Urban Spaces 3. Berlin, Munich, and Boston: De Gruyter, 2015.

van Bremen 1996

Riet van Bremen. *The Limits of Participation. Women and Civic Life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology 15. Amsterdam: Gieben, 1996.

van Bremen 2013

Riet van Bremen. "Neoi in Hellenistic Cities: Age Class, Institution, Association?" In *Groupes et associations dans les cités grecques (IIIe siècle av. J.-C.–IIe siècle apr. J.-C.)*. *Actes de la table ronde de Paris, INHA, 19–20 juin 2009*. Ed. by P. Fröhlich and P. Hamon. Hautes études du monde gréco-romain 49. Geneva: Droz, 2013, 31–58.

van Gelder 1900

Hendrik van Gelder. *Geschichte der alten Rhodier*. Den Haag: Martinus Nijhoff, 1900.

van Nijf 2013

Onno M. van Nijf. "Ceremonies, Athletics and the City: Some Remarks on the Social Imaginary of the Greek City of the Hellenistic Period". In *Shifting Social Imaginaries in the Hellenistic Period. Narrations, Practices, and Images*. Ed. by E. Stavrianopoulou. Mnemosyne Supplements 363. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2013, 311–338.

Vitale 2014

Marco Vitale. "Gymnasiarch über wie viele 'Gymnasien' über welches Einzugsgebiet? Zum Kompetenzbereich von Gymnasiarchen in späthellenistischer und römischer Zeit". *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 188 (2014), 171–180.

Walbank 1957

Frank W. Walbank. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius I. Commentary on Books I–VI*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.

Wiemer 2002

Hans-Ulrich Wiemer. *Krieg, Handel und Piraterie. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des hellenistischen Rhodos*. Klio. Beihefte N.F. 6. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2002.

Wiemer 2003

Hans-Ulrich Wiemer. "Käufliche Priestertümer im hellenistischen Kos". *Chiron* 33 (2003), 263–310.

Wörrle 2007

Michael Wörrle. "Zu Rang und Bedeutung von Gymnasion und Gymnasiarchie im hellenistischen Pergamon." *Chiron* 37 (2007), 501–516.

DANIEL KAH

Dr. phil. (Marburg 2005), is researcher at the Department for Ancient History of the University of Stuttgart. His main areas of research are Greek epigraphy of the Hellenistic age, the Hellenistic *polis* (especially Rhodes and Priene) and military history.

Dr. Daniel Kah
Universität Stuttgart
Historisches Institut
Abteilung Alte Geschichte
Keplerstr. 17
70174 Stuttgart, Germany
E-Mail: daniel.kah@hi.uni-stuttgart.de

Marco Vitale

Interpreting the Plural ‘Gymnasia’ within the Context of Ruler Cult: Buildings or Festivals?

Summary

Gymnasiarchy turned into an euergetic magistracy of a few wealthy families in late Hellenistic and Roman periods. Inscriptions from Asia Minor record iterated gymnasiarchies over several years and even monthly or daily periods of office, and describe gymnasiarchs who supervised several, even as many as 7, gymnasia simultaneously. The scanty archaeological evidence challenges the idea that so many gymnasia really constituted buildings within a single polis-territory. This paper suggests to interpret such multiple gymnasia in the sense of event cycles or small-scale periods of gymnasiarchy within the festivities of ruler cult. Already in Classical times, γυμνάσια could be generally taken to mean bodily exercises. A similar meaning may apply to the epigraphic record from the Roman East.

Keywords: Gymnasiarchie; Moschion; Cratippus; Paspáros; Nikephoria

In der hellenistischen und römischen Zeit verwandelte sich die Gymnasiarchie in ein euergetisches Amt für wenige reiche Familien. Inschriften aus Asia Minor dokumentieren wiederholte Gymnasiarchien über mehrere Jahre und sogar für einzelne Monate oder Tage und nennen Gymnasiarchen, die meh-

rere und sogar bis zu 7 Gymnasia gleichzeitig beaufsichtigt haben. Die spärlichen archäologischen Befunde lassen daran zweifeln, dass es tatsächlich so viele Gymnasia innerhalb einer Polis gab. In diesem Beitrag werden solche multiplen Gymnasia als Zyklen von Aktivitäten oder kurzfristige Gymnasiarchien im Rahmen von Feierlichkeiten für den Herrscherkult interpretiert. Schon in der klassischen Zeit konnte der Begriff γυμνάσια einfach generell körperliche Übungen bezeichnen. Ähnliches mag auch für die Inschriften aus dem römischen Osten gelten.

Keywords: Festgymnasiarchie; Moschion; Cratippus; Paspáros; Nikephoria

I am grateful to Monika Trümper (Berlin), Daniel Kah (Stuttgart), Michael Wörrle (Munich), Ulrich Mania (Istanbul), Francesco Ferruti (Rome) and Ralf von den Hoff (Freiburg) for their discussion and helpful criticism of this paper. Furthermore, I would like to thank Nina King for her accurate reading of this article. The key argument put forward and developed in this study is based on an idea expressed in a previous paper by the author published in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 188, 2014, 171–180.

According to a recently discovered inscription from Roman Syria, a gymnasiarchy that spanned several provinces existed alongside the traditional civic gymnasiarchies. This gymnasiarchy was related to the ruler cult. During the same time in Pergamon, a priest of the imperial cult appears to have held the function as ‘gymnasiarch of the *Sebasta Rhomaia* in the five gymnasia’. Also, the formulation used in another Pergamene career inscription, according to which an office-holder was in charge of no fewer than ‘six gymnasia’ within the context of the provincial games of Asia also sounds somewhat unusual. Are such deviations from the standard designations of civic gymnasiarchs just exceptional cases? Research to date has mainly and – for the Classical and Hellenistic Periods – legitimately studied ‘the gymnasium’ (always expressed in the singular) within the context of its architectural features and development.¹ Whether differences based upon the respective geographical or institutional conditions play a role is seldom investigated.² The epigraphic tradition raises many questions concerning the different use of the term γυμνάσιον from Hellenism to the Roman Imperial period.³ In particular, if we examine gymnasiarchies within the context of supra-regional ruler cults and consider the different usages of the plural ‘gymnasia’ from Classical times onwards, the prevalent view that 1.) the competence of gymnasiarchs was restricted to the territories of individual poleis and, 2.) the term γυμνάσιον was exclusively used to denote buildings, starts to crumble.

1 A supra-regional gymnasiarchy in Syria

An honorary inscription from Tyre dated to the local year 169 (= 43/44 AD) represents the first explicit evidence of a “gymnasiarch of the four eparchies”:⁴ Διόδωρος vac. Ἰδου / γυμνασιαρχήσας τῶν Δ ἐπαρχιῶν / τὸ ΘΞΡ ἔτος (“Diodoros, son of Idas, was gymnasiarch of the four eparchies, (local) year 169”). The ambiguous Greek term ἐπαρχία (or *provinciae* in Latin) refers primarily to the administrative sub-divisions within the gubernatorial province of Syria (such as Phoenice or Commagene).⁵ However, studies to date have suggested that gymnasiarch’s services usually did not cover groups outside a particular polis, as stated by previous scholars such as H.-I. Marrou or P. Gauthier.⁶ W. Ameling even suggests that ‘acting for the gymnasium does not apply to any group beyond the polis’.⁷ In contrast to this, the new Tyrian inscription mentions four eparchies as the area of authority covered by the gymnasiarch Diodoros; this area went far beyond Tyre. The clarifying clause τῶν Δ ἐπαρχιῶν in the inscription has proved to be an addition made by another stonecutter in a comparably careless execution, as the inscription seems to be simply a graffito. It is not possible to determine when this addition was made.⁸ In any case, someone wished to specify the extraordinary area of responsibility of Diodoros’s office after his magistracy as gymnasiarch.

This interesting testimony from Tyre doesn’t stand alone in Syria’s epigraphic documentation: an inscription from Gerasa (today’s Jerash, in Jordan) provides the earliest parallel reference for such supra-civic offices in the context of ruler cult in Roman Syria. The stele, dat-

1 See most recently the comprehensive survey of Curty 2015 on the Hellenistic inscriptions honouring gymnasiarchs.

2 Aside from a few exceptions: e.g. Nigdelis 1995, 179 and 181; Tzifopoulos 1998; Ferruti 2004; Vitale 2014; Kah 2014; Kah 2015; Daubner 2015, 160.

3 Gehrke 2004, 413, points out that the situation was more varied and complex: “Eher könnte man von ‘Hellenistischen Gymnasien’ statt von ‘dem Hellenistischen Gymnasium’ sprechen. Anders gesagt: Die grundlegende und primäre Problematik im Forschungsfeld Gymnasium besteht jetzt eher darin, das Feld von Gemeinsamkeiten und Differenzen abzustecken [...]. Hierin sehe ich eine wichtige Aufgabe”; cf. also 418–419.

4 I. Tyros II 53–54 no. 54 incl. fig. 54 a–d; Vitale 2014, 172–174 incl. fig. 1; also cf. Rey-Coquais 1981, 30; Sartre 2004, 173–174; most recently Daubner 2015, 159–162. Year 169 is based on an enumeration of years from the moment of its acquisition of *autonomia* in 126/125 BC.

5 In Asia Minor and Syria, in particular, a gubernatorial *provincia/ἐπαρχία* was subdivided into several administrative sub-provinces that were likewise called *provinciae/ἐπαρχία*. On this particular territorial arrangement

of the Roman administrative geography and the corresponding denominations of the administrative units, cf. Marek 1993; Ziegler 1999, 137–153; Butcher 2003, 114; Marek 2003; Sartre 2004, 179; Marek 2010, part. 449–453; Vitale 2012a, *passim*; Vitale 2013, 43–48; in detail Vitale 2016, 85–89.

6 Marrou 1965, 163–164; Gauthier 1995, 9.

7 Ameling 2004, 130: “Handeln für das Gymnasium gilt keiner über die Polis hinausreichenden Gruppe”.

8 Sartre 2004, 178, reaches the logical conclusion “que Tyr abrite des concours communs aux quatre éparchies, mais que ce n’était pas encore le cas sous Claude”. Under Claudius, the gubernatorial province of Syria contained only three eparchies, namely *SyriaPhoeniceCilicia*, as Caligula had already returned *Commagene* to his friend Antiochos IV. as a kingdom in 38 AD and *Judea* was not involved in organising the provincial imperial cult. However, during the first century AD, Cappadocia may at least temporarily have formed one of the “four eparchies” of Syria in question.

ing from the early part of Hadrian’s reign, names Diodoros, son of Emmeganos, as a “(former) priest of the four eparchies in the *metropolis* Antiocheia” (ἱερασάμενος τῶν τεσσάρων ἐπαρχιῶν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῇ μητροπόλει).⁹ Likewise, the respective centres of the provincial imperial cult and workplaces of the γυμνασίαρχοι or ἱερεῖς τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν bore similar titles. For example, Laodicea had literally the privilege of being “metropolis of the four provinces”, as shown by city coinage from Caracalla to Elagabalus. The full title reads *colonia Laodicea metropolis IIII provinciarum* on coins.¹⁰

Diodoros’s designation as a gymnasiarch τῶν Δ ἐπαρχιῶν raises a number of questions that we are not really able to answer, given the currently sparse documentary evidence from the former Seleucid Empire.¹¹ In any case, it is unlikely that the Tyrian gymnasiarch was simultaneously or consecutively in charge of the gymnasia of several subdivisions of the province of Syria, as the ἱερασάμενος in Antioch on the Orontes was not the federal ‘chief priest’ of all the temples in Syria either, but was chosen to direct and (co-)finance the jointly held events of the imperial cult. Rather, Diodoros must have been referred to by this title on the occasion of the ‘common/federal games of the four provinces’ held in Tyre – perhaps, as a so-called ‘festival gymnasiarch’.¹² There are occasional hints that this function of a ‘Festgymnasiarch’,

whose ‘office’ lasted as long as the festivals, also existed within the *koina* of Macedonia, Lycia and Cyprus.¹³ As there are no exact parallels for such a gymnasiarchy, it remains unclear whether Diodoros’s gymnasiarch title was based not only on an occasional ‘Festgymnasiarchie’ – the definition of which is vague in any case – but rather on a permanent official function, an annual or monthly termed ἀρχή, because provincial assemblies convened at least once a year in the major seats of the provincial commonalities.

2 Multiple gymnasia on the provincial level in Pergamon

Comparable numerical descriptions of areas of responsibility within the context of the provincial ruler cult, such as those found in the Syrian inscriptions for Diodoros and Diogenes, can be found in several provinces of Asia Minor. In particular, the function of gymnasiarchs, who could supervise several “gymnasia” at once or one “gymnasion” for the entire province,¹⁴ is attested within the context of the provincial imperial cult in inscriptions from Pergamon,¹⁵ one of the earliest metropoleis of the province of Asia.¹⁶ During the 1st century AD, for example, Pergamon – the former royal seat of the

9 SEG 7, 847 = Jones 1928, 157 no. 16; on this, cf. the extensive commentary in Sartre 2004, 167–186. In Syria – similarly to the *koinon* of Galatia under Augustus – the highest priestly offices were not referred to literally as ἀρχιερωσύνη, ‘arch-priesthood’, but merely as ἱερωσύνη, ‘priesthood’. Despite the different wording of ἱερωσύνη versus ἀρχιερωσύνη, it is obvious that the functions of the ‘ordinary’ priesthood were equivalent to those of the so-called ‘arch-priesthood’ in other provinces. In fact, the epigraphical evidence of the title ἀρχιερεὺς (τοῦ κοινοῦ) τῆς ἐπαρχίας in Thrace provides an exemplary touchstone for our argument; IGBulg 5, 5592, ll. 3–4; cf. SEG 55, 1377; 1380. In an agonistic inscription for the athlete Artemidoros, dating from the Flavian period, Antioch is already referred to as the host city of the joint provincial games in association with the κοινὸς Συρίας Κιλικίας Φοινίκης ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ (IAG 183–186 no. 67, ll. 15–16).

10 The title appears abbreviated as METR(O) IIII – METR IIII PROV – METROPOL IIII PR; cf. Meyer 1987–1988, 89–90, no. 115, 116, 119, 122, 129; Lindgren and Kovacs 1985, 111 no. 2098; see the full discussion by Vitale 2013, 105–110 and, more recently Vitale 2013, 96–99; Vitale 2014, 172–174. Accordingly, in the period from Emperor Claudius to the first half of the third century AD, like Antioch or Laodicea, the Phoenician city of Tyre, workplace of a “gymnasiarch of the four eparchies”, served as the metropolis of an administrative area covering several eparchies. We know of at least one other case of ‘pan-provincial’ organization, the provincial assembly of the so-called *treis eparchiai* (Cilicia-Isauria-Lycaonia), which was not restricted to the individual sub-provinces alone but covered the whole territory of the gubernatorial province. E.g. Tarsos,

in inscriptions and coins, styled itself ‘first and greatest and most beautiful metropolis set before the three eparchies of Cilicia, Isauria and Lycaonia, twice neokoros’ (ἡ πρώτη καὶ μεγίστη καὶ καλλίστη μητρόπολις τῶν ὑ’ ἐπαρχιῶν Κιλικίας Ἰσαυρίας Λυκαονίας προκαθεζομένη καὶ β’ νεκόρος), in competition with Anazarbos that claimed identical privileges; for Tarsos: IGR 3, 879–880; 882; IdC 30; for Anazarbos: Sayar 2000, 25–26 no. 13; cf. Sayar 2000, 18–19 no. 4 (Caracalla); 20 no. 6 (Severus Alexander); 23–24 no. 11 (Macrinus); 24–25 no. 12 (Elagabal). See the summary in Vitale 2013, 29–30, 43–48; according to Sartre 2004, 168, besides Arabia and Syria, this “supra-provincial” commonality would have had to include the neighbouring gubernatorial provinces of Judea and Cilicia; see Vitale 2012a, 60–65 on the provincial *koinon* of Asia and Vitale 2012a, 313–319, on the provincial assembly of the so-called *treis eparchiai* (Cilicia-Isauria-Lycaonia).

11 On the amount of source material, see Daubner 2015, 149–150.

12 On the “Festgymnasiarchen”, cf. Nigdelis 1995, 181 and Scholz 2015, 79 incl. note 1.

13 Macedonia: Nigdelis 1995, 179–182; Lycia: IGR III, 495; cf. Fouilles VII, no. 69 and 233; Cyprus: Nigdelis 1995, 181 incl. n. 60. However, Nigdelis 1995, 181, notes that this liturgy did not exist in all eastern *koina* in the same way.

14 On this, cf. Quass 1993, 320 incl. note 1370; also Oehler 1912, 1993–1994; Schuler 2004, 190 incl. n. 162; Gross-Albenhausen 2004, 313–314.

15 Already pointed out by J.-P. Rey-Coquais in I. Tyros II, 54.

16 On this, cf. Vitale 2014, 172–176.

Attalids – presents C. Iulius Sacerdos as the “gymnasiarch of the twelfth *Sebasta Rhomaia* in the five gymnasia” (γυμνασίαρχος τῶν δωδεκάτων Σεβαστῶν Ῥωμαίων τῶν πέντε γυμνασίων).¹⁷ M. Tullius Cratippus was appointed as “gymnasiarch in the common/federal games of the province of Asia for the six gymnasia” (γυμνασίαρχος ἐν τῷ κοινῷ τῆς Ἀσίας τῶν ἕξ γυμνασίων) between 18/17 BC and 14 AD.¹⁸

Even though the Tyrian gymnasiarchy “of the four provinces” does not correspond word for word to these multiple gymnasiarchies from Pergamon, they do have in common a close connection with the provincial imperial cult and to the events associated with it. The combination of C. Iulius Sacerdos’s titles in particular provides tangible evidence for identifying ‘provincial’ gymnasiarchies in Pergamon: as ‘temple warden,’ *neokoros*, of the imperial temple of the Goddess Roma and priest of Tiberius, Sacerdos was simultaneously “gymnasiarch of the five gymnasia within the twelfth *Sebasta Rhomaia*”.¹⁹ The *Sebasta Rhomaia* are attested in inscriptions from 20 BC to the 2nd century AD;²⁰ according to Cassius Dio these ‘holy competitions’ were inaugurated in the year 29/28 BC.²¹ Most probably, they are an older and/or alternative designation for the ‘common (provincial/federal) games’ (the so-called κοινὸς Ἀσίας).²² The *Sebasta Rhomaia* were not just a civic festival, but explicitly organised by the *koinon* of the province of Asia (τὰ Σεβαστὰ Ῥωμαῖα τὰ τιθέμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῆς Ἀσίας).²³ If we assume a penteteteric sequence of the *Sebasta Rhomaia*, the twelfth edition superintended and, probably, also financed by Iulius Sacerdos must be dated to the year 15/16 AD. Logically, before Iulius Sacerdos held his office, other gymnasiarchs were responsible for

the previous eleven *Sebasta Rhomaia*. This suggests that a specific gymnasiarchy in Pergamon was set up for the regular holding of events within this context (besides the presidency over the provincial assembly and the provincial ‘arch-priesthood’ as well as other federal/provincial offices). Up to the late 2nd century AD, we are able to list seven festivals which were organised in Pergamon in connection with the ruler cult.²⁴ At least every year, province-wide festivals for the ruler cult were celebrated. Does the excessive number of ‘five (or seven; see below) *gymnasia*’ in Pergamon refer to such games? Did a ‘gymnasiarch of the five *gymnasia*’ supervise all the gymnasium users, especially the participating athletes, and the contests of five provincial festivals?

The respective festival or the cycle in which it was held seems to have been decisive in defining such ‘specialised’ gymnasiarchies. Perhaps, there were two levels of gymnasiarchical office-holding: one level of provincial gymnasiarchies and another level of merely civic gymnasiarchies.

Such multiple and supra-regional office holdings, which were linked to the ruler cult, constituted a significant difference to the early Hellenistic forms of gymnasiarchy, which formerly was a regular one-year magistracy limited to one gymnasium.²⁵ As the phrase ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων (“from his/her own funds”) appears in the imperial honorary decrees for gymnasiarchs comparatively more frequently than during Hellenism, scholars attribute these changes primarily to the increasing economic problems of the polis elites – ‘Mangel an Amtsträgern’ –²⁶ suggesting that the gymnasiarchy developed into an euergetic-liturgical office held by a few wealthy families.²⁷ In fact, several (either consec-

17 Hepding 1907, 321 no. 50.

18 Conze and Schuchhardt 1899, 178 no. 30; on the wealthy family of the Tullii Cratippi, see Schäfer 2000, 106–107 no. 18; for the exact dating of Cratippus’s charge, cf. Habicht 1969, 164–165; Schäfer 2000, 106–107.

19 Hepding 1907, 321 no. 50: οἱ νέοι ἐτίμησαν / Γάιον Ἰούλιον Σακέρδωτα τὸν / νεωκόρον θεᾶς Ῥώμης καὶ θεοῦ / Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος καὶ ἱερέα / Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Νέρωνος καὶ / γυμνασίαρχον τῶν δωδεκάτων / Σεβαστῶν Ῥωμαίων τῶν πέντε / γυμνασίων.

20 Moretti 1953, 151–156 no. 59.

21 Cass. Dio 51.20.9: ταῦτα μὲν ἐν τῷ χειμῶνι ἐγένετο, καὶ ἔλαβον καὶ οἱ Περγαμηνοὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν ἱερὸν ὀνομασμένον.

22 In agonistic inscriptions: Moretti 1953, 174–179 no. 65, ll. 6–7 (in Pergamon); 12–14 (consecutively in Phrygian Laodiceia and Sardeis). Contrary to the minor, ἄλλοι κοινοὶ Ἀσίας (Kyzikos, Laodikeia, Miletos, Philadelphiea, Sardeis, Tralleis) the κοινὰ Ἀσίας τὰ μεγάλα held in the three most prominent metropoleis of Asia, Ephesos, Pergamon and

Smyrna, were respectively called μεγάλα, ‘major (games)’; see on this Moretti 1953, 215–219 no. 74, ll. 8–11.

23 Moretti 1953, 151–162 no. 59–61; on the designations used for the agonistic games of the provincial commonality of Asia, cf. Burrell 2004, 20–21; Marek 2010, 615–616; Remijsen 2015, 72; on the *Rhomaia* in Lycia, in particular, see Reitzenstein 2011, 72–73.

24 *Asklepeia Augusteia, Herakleia, Koina Asias, Kommodeia, Nikephoria, Olympia, Sebasta Rhomaia, Traianeia Deiphileia*; on this Moretti 1954, 282.

25 On the gymnasiarchy as an annual magistracy, see e.g. Ameling 2004, 146; Schuler 2004; Curty 2015, 9–12.

26 Quass 1993, 321; followed by Scholz 2015, 85–86: “[...] alsbald notorische Mangel an Kandidaten, die auf ein hinreichendes Vermögen zurückgreifen konnten”.

27 Recent research on the Hellenistic gymnasiarchy in particular has assumed that this institution underwent a gradual change from the Classical period onwards. The studies of C. Schuler and P. Scholz point out

utively or simultaneously) iterated gymnasiarchies, or even gymnasiarchies lasting several years, are almost the norm during the Imperial period.²⁸ However, the argument of increasing financial burdens does not necessarily exclude that the corresponding gymnasiarchies were not furthermore officially regulated as 'magistracies,' ἀρχή. Our assumption is supported by an important extract from imperial regulations (related to a constitution of Hadrian) collected by the Roman jurist Modestinus. The relevant passage states that philosophers and other prominent professions are to be given immunity, during their term of appointment, from all sorts of public services for the community (expressed by the generic term ὑπηρεσία ἔθνικη, 'service/office for the ἔθνος provincial duties'),²⁹ such as embassies or the functions of gymnasiarchy and agoranomy: The term ἔθνος is attested in inscriptions and on coins from different periods and different provinces of Asia Minor, mostly within the same meaning as province or (provincial) κοινόν.³⁰ If the agoranomy was still a magistracy during the second and third centuries AD, the same must be implied for the gymnasiarchy.

A difficulty remains that our inscriptions, which mainly describe the career steps of gymnasiarchs, tell us almost nothing – compared with other magistra-

cies – about the institutional position and the election or appointment procedure of gymnasiarchs during Hellenism and Roman times: we cannot determine reliably whether provincial gymnasiarchies and/or gymnasiarchies over multiple *gymnasia* constituted a permanent function, a magistracy of its own; or, alternatively, on given occasions the respective civic gymnasiarch was regularly responsible not only for the board and lodging of the usual civic users of the gymnasium, but also for all the province's participating festival delegations, for other foreigners and for the Romans.³¹ However, an honorary inscription from the Macedonian polis Beroia provides a strong indication that, in at least the Macedonian provincial *koinon*, a regular charge as 'provincial/federal gymnasiarch' existed in the late 1st century AD along with other, well known, provincial/federal functions (e.g. ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν Σεβαστῶν καὶ ἀγωνοθέτης τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Μακεδόνων). The honorand, T. Claudius Pierion, was literally καὶ δις γυμνασίαρχος δόγματι συνέδρων Μακεδονίας καὶ πρῶτος τῆς ἐπαρχείας.³² Depending on our reading of the word order, the dedication seems to reveal that he was appointed by the decision of the delegates of the Macedonian *koinon* to his office of gymnasiarch.³³ This example fits well with

that from the early Hellenistic period of the 4th century BC onwards, a model of magistratical gymnasiarchy developed that differed from the liturgical gymnasiarchy of classical Athens (Schuler 2004, 172–178); over the course of the Imperial period, this office took on a more euergetic and liturgical character once more and became the concern of a few wealthy families (for example, towards the end of the 3rd century AD in Egypt, the gymnasiarchy was even awarded on a daily basis to different functionaries; on this, see Drecoll 1997, 79–85).

- 28 E.g. Quass 1993, 316; Schuler 2004, 189–191. Cf. the commentary by Blümel in I. Iasos no. 84; followed by Schuler 2004, 190. However, at least there is no question of iteration in these formulations, for the iteration of the office is made unequivocally clear as such in inscriptions by the use of numerical symbols and numerical words, usually as ordinals (e.g. IG V, 1, 535: ἐπὶ τῇ δευτέρᾳ γυμνασιαρχίᾳ).
- 29 Dig. Modestinus 2 excus. 27. 1, 6, 8: Ὁμοίως δὲ τοῦτοις ἄπασιν ὁ θεώτατος πατήρ μου παρελθὼν εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν διατάγματι τὰς ὑπαρχούσας τιμὰς καὶ ἀτελείας ἐβεβαίωσεν, γράψας φιλοσόφους ῥήτορας γραμματικούς ἰατροὺς ἀτελεῖς εἶναι γυμνασιαρχῶν ἀγορανομῶν ἱερῶν συνῶν ἐπισταθμῶν σιτωνίας ἐλαιωνίας καὶ μήτε πρεσβεύειν μήτε εἰς στρατείαν καταλέγεσθαι ἄκοντας μήτε εἰς ἄλλην αὐτοὺς ὑπηρεσίαν ἔθνικὴν ἢ τινα ἄλλην ἀναγκάζεσθαι. See on the interpretation of the phrase ὑπηρεσία ἔθνικη most recently Vitale 2016, 96–97.
- 30 The administrative use of the term ἔθνος is attested both in literary sources of the third century AD, for example in Cassius Dio (Freyburger-Galland 1997, 34–35; Sherwin-White 1973, 437–444; cf. part. Bertrand 1982, 173–174 incl. n. 56), as well as in inscriptions from the early Principate (Eck 2007, 197–198); see in general Vitale 2014; in detail, cf. Vitale 2012a, 31–38. The Lycian league in particular (Behrwald 2000, 170–173),

but also the *koina* of Asia, Bithynia, Galatia and Macedonia (cf. Deininger 1965, 137 for the ἔθνη of the provinces of Asia (e.g. TAM 5.2.990), Lycia, Bithynia, Galatia, Macedonia) or Pamphylia (cf. Şahin 2004, 19–20 no. 294; 42–43 no. 321; İplikcioglu, G. Çelgin, and V. Çelgin 2007, 69–70 no. 13; see the discussion in Vitale 2012a, 272–277) were each referred to respectively as ἔθνος in imperial inscriptions, mostly as an alternative to the more common term κοινόν.

- 31 On the accommodation for groups from outside the polis, see Mango 2004, 275–278; similarly, Chaniotis 1995, 156–161; e.g. OGIS 339 = I. Sestos 1, ll. 30–33: γυμνασί/αρχός τε αἰρεθείς τῆς τε εὐταξίας τῶν ἐφήβων καὶ τῶν νέων προενοήθη, / τῆς τε ἄλλης εὐσημιοσύνης τῆς κατὰ τὸ γυμνάσιον ἀντελάβετο καλῶς κα[ι] / φιλοτίμως (Menas decree from Sestos, 125 BC); I. Priene 113, l. 40–45 (1st century BC); IG VII, 2712, ll. 25–29: ἡρίστισε <δ>[ἐ τῇ]ν πόλιν τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ / ἀπ' ἐ[κ]θέμ[α]τος ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ, μηδ[ἐ]να π[α]ραλιπὼν οὐ μόνον τῶν / ἐνοί[κων] αὐτῶν, [ἀλ.]λ' οὐδὲ τῶν παρεπι[δ]η[μ]οῦ[ν]των ξένων σὺν παι[σ]ιν ἐ[λ]ευ[θ]έρ[ο]ις <ε> καὶ τοῖς τῶν πολειτῶν δοῦ[λο]ις <δ>[ι]ὰ τὸ φιλόδοξον / ἦθος. (Honorary decree for Epameinondas from Akraiphia, under Nero).
- 32 SEG 27, 262: Τὸν διὰ βίου ἀρχιερέα τῶν / Σεβαστῶν καὶ ἀγωνοθέτην / τοῦ κοινοῦ Μακεδόνων Τι (βέριον) Κλαύδιον / Πειριῶνα, Τι (βέριου) Κλαυδίου Πειριῶνος / ὄν καὶ δις γυμνασίαρχον δόγματι συνέδρων / Μακεδονίας καὶ πρῶτον τῆς ἐπαρχείας, φυλῇ / Βερεικῇ· δι' ἐπιμελη- τοῦ Γ(αίου) Μορίου Δομιτίου / καὶ γραμματέως Λ(ουκίου) Νασιδιηνοῦ Οὐάλεντος; *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 79, 1955, 274 = J. and L. Robert, BE, 1956, no. 150; Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 147–151.
- 33 Contrary to the concerns of Nigdelis 1995, 179–180 about the syntax of this sentence, our reading of δις γυμνασίαρχος δόγματι συνέδρων Μακε-

the definition of gymnasiarchies as an ὑπηρεσία ἐθνική in Hadrian's constitution.

3 Multiple gymnasia on the civic level in Asia Minor

There are many epigraphic examples of multiple gymnasiarchies which do not reveal any direct link to the ruler cult or to province-wide events. However, they all point to a specific aspect of provincial gymnasiarchies: the listing of several *gymnasia* could also express cycles of events or terms of office (most likely monthly terms). During Hadrian's reign, for example, a "gymnasiarch over the seven gymnasia" (γυμνασίαρχος τῶν ζ' γυμνασίων)³⁴ named Tib. Claudius Menogenes officiated in Pergamon. During the 1st century AD, the "participants of the third gymnasium" (μετέχοντες τοῦ τρίτου γυμνασίου) in the Lydian city of Thyateira honoured Tib. Claudius Antyllos, the "(former) gymnasiarch of all gymnasia" (γυμνασιάρχης πᾶντα τὰ γυμνάσια).³⁵ In these cases, as in further cases of 'three', 'four' or 'all' gymnasia in Iasos, Perge or Miletus,³⁶ some scholars argue that the honorands presided over different age categories, perhaps in different premises (παῖδες ἔφηβοι νέοι πρεσβύτεροι).³⁷ As it happens, the services provided by a multiple gymnasiarchy could have had beneficiaries other than just "age groups", as seen e.g. in an honorary inscription from Miletus, where τῶν πολιτῶν are mentioned too,³⁸ or an inscription from Kaunos that honours the "(former) gymnasiarch of all age groups and ev-

ery class".³⁹

Nevertheless, the mention of several γυμνάσια need not necessarily and exclusively refer to several different 'gymnasia' in the sense of buildings or rooms for different age categories/groups of users. In the inscription from Thyateira, for instance, it is striking that the μετέχοντες (i.e. the "participants of the third gymnasium") are not specified as a particular age category. The expression "third gymnasium" implies a rank or an order, which does not fit for buildings. A funerary inscription on a marble base from Tralleis dating from the second half of the first century AD provides a prime touchstone for this argument: "[Claudius Epigonianos] financed from his own funds the first four-month period of the three gymnasia".⁴⁰ According to this, the gymnasiarch financed a four-month period, namely the "first": An entire year has 12 months that is exactly "three" four-month periods, which apparently correspond to the τρία γυμνάσια within the same phrase. This plural form cannot refer to buildings but refers to time periods of a gymnasiarch's office.⁴¹

It is especially four-month terms of office that are illustrated by several inscriptions from Western Asia Minor. A so-called prophetes inscription from Didyma attests a four-month gymnasiarchy (ἐπὶ τετράμηνον) over three different groups of users at one time.⁴² Contemporary honorary inscriptions from Magnesia report separately both a four-month (τετράμηνον) and a two-month (δίμηνον) term of gymnasiarchal office for Moschion, son of Moschion.⁴³ In Stratonikeia even daily terms of office are witnessed: An inscription of Aelia Glykinna and

δονίας is supported by the phrase πρώτος ἐπαρχείας δόγματι κοινοβουλίου in the honorary inscription of the Bithyniarch Tib. Claudius Piso: IK 27, 47, ll. 1-6: [τὸν ἀσύνκρι]τον καὶ Ὀλύμπιον [καὶ] / [πρώτο]ν ἐπαρχείας δόγματι / [κοιν]οβουλίου καὶ προή[γο]ρ[ον] / [τοῦ] ἔθ[η]νους καὶ δεκάπρωτον / [καὶ] πολιτογράφον καὶ ἄρχοντα / τ[ῆς] πατρίδος καὶ τῆς ἐπαρχείας (...). In this case, too, the appointment decision notice is quoted only after the relevant official title of the honorand. A syntactically analogous formulaic expression in Latin relates to the appointment of high-priests of the provincial imperial cult, for example, in Hispania Baetica: flamines Divi Augusti, consensu concilii provinciae Baeticae; cf. AE 1971, 183, l. 6; AE 1966, 181, ll. 7-8, 191; CIL 2, 2221, l. 6.

34 Iv Pergamon III 37, ll. 6-8.

35 TAM V 2, 975.

36 In Perge, the priest of the imperial cult and Agonothet Cn. Postumius Cornutus referred to his father's two demiurgies and gymnasiarchies "of the three gymnasia" (I. Perge 61: υἱὸς δις δημιουργοῦ γυμνασιάρχου τῶν τριῶν γυμνασίων) in his honorary decree from the late Flavian period; according to an honorary decree from Iasos, the former *Stephanophoros* Alexandros was in charge of as many as four gymnasia (I. Iasos 84, ll. 5-8); an inscription from Miletus/Didyma refers to a gymnasiarchy "over all

gymnasia" (CIG 2885 = Milet I 3, 343, Z. 13-14: γυμνασίαρχος πάντων τῶν γυμνασίων) cf. also Milet I 3, 237, 255, 256, 261, 278, 292, 301. See on this Herrmann 1994, 203-236.

37 Cf. in general Marrou 1965, 173-174 incl. note 24; A. Rehm on Miletus I 7, 337 no. 265; also Nilsson 1955, 34; Blümel I. Iasos on no. 84; Schuler 2004, 190.

38 SEG 4, 425 = Milet I 7, 336, 338 no. 265, ll. 8-11: γυμνασίαρχος τῶν νέων, γυμνασίαρχος τῶν πατέρων, γυμνασίαρχος τῶν πολιτῶν (...).

39 Marek 2006, 319-326 no. 139 IIIc, ll. 4-5: γυμνασιάρχης πάσης ἡλικίας καὶ τύχης.

40 I. Tralleis 75, ll. 6-9: (...) γυμνασιάρχῃσαντα τῶν τριῶν γυμνασίων τὴν πρώτην τετράμηνον ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων (...).

41 I am indebted to Christian Marek (Zurich) for this idea.

42 Milet I 3, 258, ll. 4-7: γεγυμνασία[ρ]χῆκώς τῶν νέων καὶ τῶ[ν] / πολιτῶν καὶ τῆς γερο[υ]σίας ἐπὶ τετράμηνον; cf. Milet I 3, 250.

43 I. Magnesia 164, ll. 5-7: καὶ γυμνασιάρχῃσαντα τετράμηνον τῆς / πόλεως ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ δίμηνον γερο[υ]σίας / γυμνασιάρχῃσαντα; see on the career of Moschion the discussion by Robert 1967, 103-105; Strubbe 1987 48 n. 5; Quass 1993, 267; Fernoux 2007, 181-182.

her husband Ti. Claudius Aristetas Menander (from the end of the second century AD) describes them as having been the “first” (πρῶτοι) in the city who held their (contemporaneous!) gymnasiarchies just during the two days of the annual procession called the κλειδὸς πομπή at the site of Hekate’s cult in Lagina in Stratonikeia.⁴⁴ A further inscription from the early third century AD mentions “the key-bringing on the insurmountable day of the goddess in the sacred month”.⁴⁵ Therefore, we can plausibly infer that Aelia Glykinna and Ti. Claudius Aristetas Menander took their office as gymnasiarchs not only for two days (as emphasized by the inscription I.Stratonikeia 701) but formally for the whole duration of the “sacred month”: the gymnasiarchy of Aelia Glykinna and Ti. Claudius Aristetas Menander was most probably a one-month magistracy. Thus, aside from different groups of users, a gymnasiarch could also preside over many events or finance monthly (or even daily?) small-scale periods of office respectively which were likewise called *gymnasia*.⁴⁶

4 Different usages of the plural *gymnasia* (classical period third century AD)

Similar different, technical-formulaic usages of the term *gymnasion*, especially in its plural form in the Greek East, had long been known from the Late Classical and Hel-

lenistic literary records, as shown by F. Ferruti and Y.T. Tzifopoulos.⁴⁷ For instance, in relevant text passages of Plato,⁴⁸ Aristotle and the early imperial Greek geographer Strabo, the plural γυμνάσια could refer specifically to ‘bodily exercises’.⁴⁹ Particularly in connection with Cretan gymnastic traditions of military training Aristoteles observes that slaves in Crete were conferred almost the same rights as free citizens, “except that they are forbidden gymnastic exercises (γυμνάσια) and the possession of arms”.⁵⁰ Some centuries after Aristoteles, Strabo also stresses the fact that freeborn Cretans “were accustomed from childhood to the use of arms, and to endure fatigue. Hence they disregarded heat and cold, rugged and steep roads, blows received in gymnastic exercises and in set battles (ἐν γυμνασίοις καὶ μάχαις)”.⁵¹ The alternative usage of the term γυμνάσια, taken as meaning ‘bodily exercises (primarily for military purposes)’, is comparable to the different usage of the plural term δρόμοι (the singular form δρόμος originally meaning “racetrack”) in Classical Crete. According to the Byzantine grammarian Aristophanes (3rd century BC), the ephebes in Crete were simply called ἀπόδρομοι because, in contrast to an adult δρομεύς, they weren’t sufficiently trained for the “common footraces” (κοινοὶ δρόμοι).⁵² Accordingly, the Suda, a 10th-century Byzantine lexicon, even explains that in Crete the plural terms δρόμοι and γυμνάσια were used with the same mean-

44 I. Stratonikeia 701, ll. 8–10: ἐγυμνασί[α]ρησαν δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει / τῇ τῆς κλειδὸς πομπῇ ἡμέρας δύο πρῶτοι καὶ ἐν τῷ περι/πολίῳ τὰς εἰθισμένας ἡμέρας; on the Stratonikeian κλειδὸς πομπῇ see in detail Williamson 2013, 217–218.

45 I. Stratonikeia 704, ll. 7–9: (...) κ(αί) γυμνασιαρχήσαντες ἔν τε τῷ περιπολίῳ / πάσας τὰς τῶν ἐστιάσεων ἡμέρας, ἐν δὲ τῇ πόλει κ(αί) τῷ περιπολίῳ τὰς τῆς ἱερομηνίας / ἐν τῇ κλιδαγωγίᾳ τῆς θεοῦ ἡμέρας ἀνυπερβλήτως (...); translation by Williamson 2013, 217 n. 38.

46 Regular offices which lasted just for several months are not a novelty for Western Asia Minor and, above all, they are not limited to Roman imperial time: In an honorary decree of the *demoi* of Erythrai from 277/275 BC nine ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ καὶ φιλότιμοι, who helped to defend the city against the Galatians, are attested to have served as στρατηγοὶ in “the first four-month period”. Probably, each of the three four-month periods (which, together, constituted a whole magistracy-year) was alternately taken over by three of the nine *strategoi*; cf. Ed. pr. A.M. Fontrier, Correspondance: inscription d’Erythrae, Frontrier 1879, 388–392, ll. 2–8 = Syll³ 410: ἐπ/ειδὴ οἱ στρατηγοὶ οἱ στρατηγήσαντες τὴν πρώτην / τε-τράμηνον ἐφ’ ἱεροποιοῦ Ἠγησαγόρου, Σίμος Ἀπολλωνίου, Φύρσων Ἰατροκλείους, Ἀθήναιος Διονυσίου, Ἀνα[ξί]κράτης Θρασυβούλου, Ἑκατάς Γνώτου, Πύθεος Πυθέο[υ], / [Α]πελλίκων Πειθαγόρου, Μοιρώνας Ἐνδήμου, Λήν[αιος] / [Η]ρογ[ένου], (...).

47 Ferruti 2004; Tzifopoulos 1998.

48 See in Pl. Leg., 625c–d the discussion between an Athenian and Clinias from Crete on the various forms of constitution: Κλεινίας: πάνυ μὲν οὖν: ἰδόντες δὲ μᾶλλον φήσομεν. ἀλλ’ ἴωμεν ἀγαθὴ τύχη. – Ἀθηναῖος: ταῦτ’ εἶη. καὶ μοι λέγε: κατὰ τί τὰ συσσίτια τε ὑμῖν συντέταχεν ὁ νόμος καὶ τὰ γυμνάσια καὶ τὴν τῶν ὅπλων ἔξιν.

49 Cf. with further attestations, LSJ² 1968, s.v. γυμνάσιον, 262; see on this the discussions by Ferruti 2004, 286–288; Tzifopoulos 1998, 151.

50 Arist. Pol. II 1264a, 21–22: ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ τὰλλα ταῦτα τοῖς δούλοις ἐφέντες μόνον ἀπειρήκασιν τὰ γυμνάσια καὶ τὴν τῶν ὅπλων κτῆσιν.

51 Strab. 10.4.16 = C 480: πρὸς δὲ τὸ μὴ δειλίαν ἀλλ’ ἀνδρείαν κρατεῖν ἐκ παιδῶν ὅπλοις καὶ πόνοις συντρέφειν, ὥστε καταφρονεῖν καύματος καὶ ψύχους καὶ τραχείας ὁδοῦ καὶ ἀνάντους καὶ πληγῶν τῶν ἐν γυμνασίοις καὶ μάχαις ταῖς κατὰ σύνταγμα.

52 Slater 1986, 31–32. The distinction between the ephebic ἀπόδρομος and the adult δρομεύς is e.g. expressed in an inscription from Gortyna, mid-5th century BC, ICret IV, 72, col. VII, ll. 29–47. In the same way as δρόμοι, the meaning of the singular δρόμος can shift: according to Sophocles’ tragedy, “Electra”, Orestes won the δρόμος within the Pythian Games (Soph. El., ll. 681–687). In this case, δρόμος means a particular athletic competition, namely the footrace, but not the racetrack in itself (cf. also the inscriptions ICret I, 19, 3A, ll. 39–43 and ICret III, 4, 4, ll. 11–13); likewise, Ferruti 2004, 287 and Pleket 2014, 36, translate δρόμος as “footrace” in this context.

ing.⁵³ However, this non-architectural word usage of “γυμνάσια” does not apply only to the situation in Classical Crete because it’s not a question of local epigraphic habit or linguistic phenomenon within a specific period of time. Rather, it is a more general problem of our philological understanding. For the word γυμνάσια already existed as a term in the general use for ‘bodily exercises’ in late Classical literature, for example in Herodotus, talking about Tisamenus’s training for athletic contests (ὁ μὲν δὴ ἀμαρτῶν τοῦ χρηστηρίου προσεῖχε γυμνασίοισι ὡς ἀναιρησόμενος γυμνικοὺς ἀγῶνας),⁵⁴ or in Hippocrates’s reflections on the treatment of dislocated limbs, particularly legs (οὕτω δὲ καρτερόν γίνεται τὸ ὑγιὲς σκέλος: ἔν τε γὰρ τῇ φύσει διαιτᾶται, καὶ τὰ γυμνάσια προσκρατύνει αὐτό).⁵⁵

Some centuries later, analogous variations in meaning for the Latin transcription ‘*gymnasium*’ are traceable in the epigraphic habit of Roman North Africa, particularly Africa proconsularis.⁵⁶ The interest in Greek athletics emerged mainly during the first and second century in these exclusively Latin speaking regions. This phenomenon was connected to Africa’s great prosperity and improving political position, especially in the reign of Septimius Severus.⁵⁷ According to the 2nd century Latin author Tertullian from Carthage, “acting Greek” became fashionable also in clothing style.⁵⁸ As already pointed out by G. G. Fagan and R. Lafer, the closer philological analysis of African inscriptions from the period between the reigns of Trajan and Probus reveals that also the *gymnasia* commemorated there cannot be just buildings or rooms.⁵⁹ On the contrary, according to the

inscriptions these *gymnasia* were ‘dedicated’ (*dedicare*), ‘staged’ (*praestare* and *exhibere*), ‘offered’ (*praebere*), ‘ordered’ (*decernere*), ‘issued’ (*edere*) or, expressly, ‘financed’ (*insumere*):⁶⁰ accordingly, the *gymnasia* are always ‘given’ as benefactions to the *populus* or to other groups and sometimes games, meals and cash handouts are specified.⁶¹

Thus, in our epigraphic record from late Hellenistic and Imperial Asia Minor and Syria too, the Greek term γυμνάσιον did shift in meaning depending on where it appeared; its meaning was contextually, not absolutely, determined. Especially in regard to the six [reign of Augustus], five [reign of Tiberius] and seven [reign of Hadrian] *gymnasia* attested in Pergamon, the idea both of several gymnasium buildings or of different age groups is problematic for the reason alone that we have no archaeological or literary explicit evidence for so many buildings or age groups.⁶² The chronological order of our attestations, six or five or seven *gymnasia*, does not necessarily correspond to a presumptive steadily growing number of gymnasium buildings in the polis-territory of Pergamon. At the most, we could assume that, besides the four traditional age categories, other groups of gymnasium users (e.g. festival delegations, Romans, foreigners) had been added to the official group of recipients of gymnasiarchal services but, with this explanation, the inconsistency between the numbers of groups still remains a difficulty.

Nevertheless, e.g. J. Delorme, L. Robert, H.-I. Marrou and W. Radt relate the high number of *gymnasia* to buildings within the polis territory of Pergamon.⁶³

53 Ed. A. Adler, 141 no. 1535: “Ἀρόμοις· τοῖς γυμνασίοις κατὰ Κρήτας”. However, there’s no semantic equivalence between the two terms, but only an analogy of their variable usage; see on this Ferruti 2004, 288.

54 Hdt. 9.33.2: Τισαμενῶ γὰρ μαντευομένῳ ἐν Δελφοῖσι περὶ γόνου ἀνέϊλε ἡ Πυθίη ἀγῶνας τοὺς μεγίστους ἀναιρήσεσθαι πέντε. ὁ μὲν δὴ ἀμαρτῶν τοῦ χρηστηρίου προσεῖχε γυμνασίοισι ὡς ἀναιρησόμενος γυμνικοὺς ἀγῶνας, ἀσκέων δὲ πεντάεθλον παρὰ ἐν πάλαισμα ἔδραμε νικᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδα, Ἰερωνίμῳ τῷ Ἀνδρίῳ ἐλθὼν ἐς ἔριν.

55 Hp. Art. 58: ἦν δὲ μὴ προσχρήεται τῷ συναρῶ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ἀλλὰ, μετέωρον ἔχων, σκίπῳ ἀντερείδεται, οὕτω δὲ καρτερόν γίνεται τὸ ὑγιὲς σκέλος: ἔν τε γὰρ τῇ φύσει διαιτᾶται, καὶ τὰ γυμνάσια προσκρατύνει αὐτό. Moreover, the 4th century Athenian playwright Epicrates (cited by Rocci 1974, s.v. γυμνάσιον, 404) refers the expression ἐν γυμνασίοις Ἀκαδημείας most probably for the athletic training in the Athenian Academia; cf. Pind. fr. 129.4.

56 I’m thankful to Daniel Kah (Stuttgart) for this hint.

57 Remijsen 2015, 157–160.

58 Tert. *pall.* 4.1.

59 Fagan 1999; Lafer 2013.

60 See the detailed compilation of sources in Lafer 2013, 60–61.

61 Fagan 1999, 263, draws the conclusion that there is no “universally-applicable meaning to *gymnasia*. On the broad view, the word seems to have had no more precise a meaning than “things to do with exercise”. Similarly, Lafer 2013, 66: “gymnische Aufführungen”, “athletische Agone”.

62 We have evidence for, at most, five age groups as an exception in the context of games and festival events; on this, cf. Weiler 2004, 31–33. On an earlier stage of my research I proposed to search these gymnasium-buildings within the huge territory/*chora* of Pergamon, see on this Vitale 2013, 93.

63 Delorme 1960, 178–181; Radt 1999, 113–134; in part. 113–114; H.-I. Marrou goes a step further in identifying not only the conventional civic gymnasiarch in Pergamon, but also a kind of “arch-gymnasiarch” or “gymnasiarque général” (Marrou 1965, 174). However, his assumption is doubtful: while the position of a ὑπογυμνασίαρχος, a “deputy gymnasiarch” or sub-gymnasiarch (cf. Schuler 2004, 178 and Nilsson 1955, 54) is attested, none of our multiple gymnasiarchs appear specifically as

Based on the formulation of an honorary decree for Diodoros Paspas, four gymnasium buildings were located in Pergamon (Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1904, 152 no. 1, l. 58: [- - - ὅπως μήποτε ἐπιλ]ίπρι τήν εἰς τὰ τέσσαρα γυμνά[σια - -]). Due to the poor state of conservation of the inscription – the text sections directly before and behind the relevant passage are completely damaged –, we cannot safely say to what context these four gymnasia are to be related within the career of Diodoros. With respect to the problematic source situation, W. Radt points out that the location of such a large number of gymnasia remains an unsolved problem,⁶⁴ not to mention the 'seven gymnasia' of Tib. Claudius Menogenes. Given the ambiguity of the term γυμνάσια, perhaps our suggestion to interpret multiple gymnasia in the sense of event cycles within the festivities of ruler cult or gymnasiarchal office-periods respectively, would provide, in many questionable cases, a possible answer to the *controversa quaestio*, at least in regard to architectural archaeology.

The 'four gymnasia' of Diodoros Paspas may be put in relation with our body of imperial-period examples of multiple gymnasiarchies taken from the context of supra-regional ruler worship, for in a further inscription Diodoros Paspas is honoured by decree of the *demos* because, among other things, he served as gymnasiarch in the twenty-ninth *Nikephoria*, that is, the cyclical games and sacrifices instituted by the Attalid kings after their victories over the Galatians and celebrated in honour of 'victory-bearing' Athena.⁶⁵ The mention of the *Nikephoria* in these few inscriptions is

not intended solely as 'formulaic' date information for Diodoros' gymnasiarchy, as suggested for example by L. Meier and A. Chankowski,⁶⁶ for a large number of Pergamene inscriptions combine the *prytanis* and a priest in the official dating formula (ἐπὶ πρυτάνεως καὶ ἱερέως).⁶⁷ Rather, the mention of the *Nikephoria* refers to the gymnasiarch's concrete involvement in this specific festival, most probably in its agonistic features.⁶⁸ At least one of Diodoros's four gymnasiarchies thus seems to have been held within the *Nikephoria*. As R. von den Hoff has recently shown,⁶⁹ the Attalid kings are materially present in the Pergamene 'Great gymnasium' in terms of sculptural and epigraphic remains – significantly, the relevant statues all appear to be wearing military uniform. Apparently, in Pergamon the gymnasium was also a place where the Attalid dynasty was worshipped. This Worship was probably related to the *Nikephoria*.

5 Closing remarks

It is not surprising that as dynastic festivals, the *Nikephoria* have their origin in the ruler cult, too. According to Cassius Dio's review of the genesis of the province-wide imperial cult in Asia Minor, Pergamon was one of the first poleis to possess an officially recognized site for the emperor's divinization and worship.⁷⁰ Therefore, the staging of the imperial cult in Pergamon in particular required that the services of the gymnasiarch be expanded accordingly.⁷¹ Probably, for the same reason the office of a 'gymnasiarch of the four eparchies' emerged

an *Archi-Gymnasiarch* – in analogy to the provincial *Archiereis* of the imperial cult, for example. See on the 'six gymnasia' of Tullius Cratippus Robert 1962, 9–11: "il est fort possible que la personne honorée ait été en même temps ou successivement gymnasiarque des six gymnases de la ville."

64 Radt 1999, 113: "Ein bisher ungelöstes Problem ist die Lokalisierung dieser großen Zahl von überlieferten Gymnasien".

65 Hepding 1907, 313 no. 36, ll. 4–5: γυμνα[σ]ιαρχοῦντα ἐν τ[οῖς] ἐννεακαικεῖστοις / Νικη[φο]ρίαις; Hepding 1907, 311 no. 34, l. 3: γυμν[ασιαρ]χήσαντα τὰ ἐ[ν]ν[ε]ακα[ικεῖ]στ[οις] Νικηφόρια.

66 Meier 2012, 334, 341 no. 48; part. 336; Chankowski 1998, 168 translates: „[Le peuple a honoré Diodoros] qui exerça sa gymnasiarchie pendant les vingt-neuvièmes *Nikephoria*“; 170: „Il ne s'agit pas, soulignons-le, d'un gymnasiarque nommé spécialement pour l'organisation de la fête, mais bien du gymnasiarque du gymnase qui, en vertu de sa fonction, joue un rôle important dans cette manifestation religieuse et civique“; similarly von den Hoff 2004, 388–389; in contrast to this view Kohl 2002, 251 „der an der Ausgestaltung der Feiern beteiligt war“.

67 Sherk 1992, 238–239 no. 148.

68 Similar phrases like γυμνασίαρχος ἐν τῷ κοινῷ τῆς Ἀσίας honouring M. Tullius Cratippus (see above) or – even more relevant ὁ δῆμος Μητρὶν Ἀρτεμιδώρου ἱερητεύσασαν τὰ ἑνάτα Νικηφόρια τοῦ στεφανίου ἀγῶνος (OGIS 299, ll. 1–4) – connected to Metris's priestly office for the *Nikephoria* of Athena, apparently relate to the charges of the hon-orands within the mentioned festivals.

69 Especially his paper, *Kings in the Gymnasium. The Case of Pergamon and the Attalid Rulers*, presented at this conference; cf. also Wörle 2007, 511–512.

70 Cass. Dio 51.20.6–8; cf. the commentaries by Deininger 1965, 16–19; Mitchell 1993, 100–102; Burrell 2004, 17–18; Campanile 2007, 138–140; Reitzenstein 2011, 25–26; Vitale 2012a, 63–64; Vitale 2012b, 167–169.

71 Continuities between the worship of Hellenistic rulers and Roman governors on the one hand and the imperial cult on the other hand can be observed in several respects: especially in the Poleis of Western Asia Minor there was traditionally a common practice to offer cults to Roman magistrates and to the city of Rome itself; see e.g. the festivities Μουκί-εια, Φλάκκεια, Λευκόλλεια honouring Q. Mucius Scaevola (97 BC), L. Valerius Flaccus (90 BC) and L. Licinius Lucullus (71 BCE). For the cult of ΘΕΑ ΡΩΜΗ cf. Mellor 1975 and Mellor 1981; Fayer 1976.

in the province of Syria. However, in light of the scant sources from all other poleis, we need still more epigraphical testimonies for the conclusive answer to the question of whether such “provincial” gymnasiarchies were only created *ad hoc* or were established as regular official functions. However, the fact, that imperial inscriptions frequently mention multiple “gymnasia” as superintended by the same office holder, cannot be exclusively explained by the existence of so many different gymnasium buildings within the relevant city terri-

tory or so many groups of gymnasium users. Rather, the relatively high numbers of gymnasia may be related to the growing number of cyclical games and festivities on the provincial level in the respective centers of ruler cult on the one hand and to the growing number of merely monthly period offices of gymnasiarchy on the other hand. As also Classical and Hellenistic literary sources demonstrate, the term ‘gymnasium’ could assume different meanings depending on the context.

Bibliography

Ameling 2004

Walter Ameling. "Wohltäter im hellenistischen Gymnasion". In *Das Hellenistische Gymnasion*. Ed. by U. Wiemer and D. Kah. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004.

Behrwald 2000

Ralf Behrwald. *Der lykische Bund. Untersuchungen zu Geschichte und Verfassung*. Bonn: Habelt, 2000.

Bertrand 1982

Jean-Marie Bertrand. "Langue grecque et administration romaine: de l'ἐπαρχία τῶν Ρωμαίων à l'ἐπαρχία τῶν Θρακῶν". *Ktema* 7 (1982), 167–175.

Burrell 2004

Barbara Burrell. *Neokoroi. Greek Cities and Roman Emperors*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Butcher 2003

Kevin Butcher. *Roman Syria and the Near East*. London and Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2003.

Campanile 2007

Maria D. Campanile. "L'assemblea provinciale d'Asia in età repubblicana". In *Tra Oriente e Occidente. Indigeni, Greci e Romani in Asia minore*. Ed. by G. Urso. Pisa: ETS, 2007, 129–140.

Chaniotis 1995

Angelos Chaniotis. "Sich selbst feiern? Städtische Feste des Hellenismus im Spannungsfeld von Religion und Politik". In *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus*. Ed. by M. Wörle and P. Zanker. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995, 147–172.

Chankowski 1998

Andrzej S. Chankowski. "La procédure législative à Pergame au Ier s. av. J.-C.: à propos de la chronologie relative des décrets en l'honneur de Diodoros Paspáros". *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 122.1 (1998), 159–199.

Conze and Schuchhardt 1899

A. Conze and C. Schuchhardt. "Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon 1886–1998". *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung* 24 (1899), 97–240, Taf. IX.

Curty 2015

Oliver Curty. *Gymnasiarchika: recueil et analyse des inscriptions de l'époque hellénistique en l'honneur des gymnasiarques*. Paris: De Boccard, 2015.

Daubner 2015

Frank Daubner. "Gymnasien und Gymnasiarchen in den syrischen Provinzen und in Arabien". In *Das kaiserzeitliche Gymnasion*. Ed. by P. Scholz and D. Wiegandt. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2015, 149–166.

Deininger 1965

Jürgen Deininger. *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit von Augustus bis zum Ende des dritten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* Munich: C. H. Beck, 1965.

Delorme 1960

Jean Delorme. *Gymnasion. Étude sur les monuments consacrés à l'éducation en Grèce (des origines à l'Empire romain)*. Paris: De Boccard, 1960.

Drecolt 1997

Carsten Drecolt. *Die Liturgien im römischen Kaiserreich des 3. und 4. Jh. n. Chr.* Stuttgart: Steiner, 1997.

Eck 2007

Werner Eck. "Die politisch-administrative Struktur der kleinasiatischen Provinzen während der hohen Kaiserzeit". In *Tra Oriente e Occidente. Indigeni, Greci e Romani in Asia Minore. Atti del convegno internazionale, Cividale del Friuli, 28–30 settembre 2006*. Ed. by G. Urso. Pisa: ETS, 2007, 189–207.

Fagan 1999

Garret G. Fagan. "Gifts of Gymnasia: A Test Case for Reading Quasi-Technical Jargon in Latin Inscriptions". *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 124 (1999), 263–275.

Fayer 1976

Carla Fayer. *Il culto della dea Roma: origine e diffusione nell'impero*. Collana di saggi e ricerche 9. Pescara: Ed. Trimestre, 1976.

Fernoux 2007

Henri-Louis Fernoux. "L'exemplarité sociale chez les notables des cités d'Asie Mineure à l'époque impériale". In *Aristocratie antique. Modèles et exemplarité sociale*. Ed. by H.-L. Fernoux and C. Stein. Dijon: Editions de l'Université de Dijon, 2007, 173–198.

Ferruti 2004

Francesco Ferruti. "Un ginnasio a Gortina in un'iscrizione del V sec. A.C.". *Creta Antica* 5 (2004), 283–293.

Freyburger-Galland 1997

Marie-Laure Freyburger-Galland. *Aspects du vocabulaire politique et institutionnel de Dion Cassius*. Paris: De Boccard, 1997.

Frontrier 1879

Aristote M. Frontrier. "Correspondance: inscription d'Erythrae". *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 3 (1879), 388–392.

Gauthier 1995

Philippe Gauthier. "Notes sur le rôle du gymnase dans les cités hellénistiques". In *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus. Kolloquium, München, 24. bis 26. Juli 1993*. Ed. by M. Wörle and P. Zanker. Vestigia 47. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1995, 1–11.

Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993

Philippe Gauthier and Militiadis Hatzopoulos. *La loi gymnasiarchique de Beroea*. Athens: Centre de Recherches de l'Antiquité Grecque et Romaine and De Boccard, 1993.

Gehrke 2004

Hans-Joachim Gehrke. "Eine Bilanz: Die Entwicklung des Gymnasions zur Institution der Sozialisierung in der Polis". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 413–419.

Gross-Albenhausen 2004

Kirsten Gross-Albenhausen. "Bedeutung und Funktion der Gymnasien für die Hellenisierung des Ostens". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 313–322.

Habicht 1969

Christian Habicht. *Die Inschriften des Asklepieions*. Altertümer von Pergamon 8.3. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1969.

Hepding 1907

H. Hepding. "Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon 1904–1905. II. Die Inschriften". *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung* 32 (1907), 241–377.

Herrmann 1994

Peter Herrmann. "Milet unter Augustus. C. Iulius Epikrates und die Anfänge des Kaiserkults". *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 44 (1994), 203–236.

von den Hoff 2004

Ralf von den Hoff. "Ornamenta γυμνασιώδης? Delos und Pergamon als Beispielfälle der Skulpturenausstattung hellenistischer Gymnasien". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 373–405.

İplikçioğlu, G. Çelgin, and V. Çelgin 2007

Bülent İplikçioğlu, Güler Çelgin, and Vedat Çelgin. *Epigraphische Forschungen in Termessos und seinem Territorium*. 4. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007.

Jones 1928

Arnold Hugh Martin Jones. "Inscriptions from Jerash". *Journal of Roman Studies* 18 (1928), 144–178.

Kah 2014

Daniel Kah. "Demokratie in der Kleinstadt. Überlegungen zu Demographie und Partizipation am Beispiel des hellenistischen Priene". In *Stadtkultur im Hellenismus*. Ed. by A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann. Heidelberg: Verlag Antike, 2014, 148–172.

Kah 2015

Daniel Kah. "Soziokultureller Wandel im hellenistischen Priene: Das Zeugnis der Ehrendekrete". In *Urbane Strukturen und bürgerliche Identität im Hellenismus*. Ed. by A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann. Heidelberg: Verlag Antike, 2015.

Kohl 2002

Markus Kohl. "Das Nikephorion von Pergamon". *Revue Archéologique* 2 (2002), 227–253.

Lafer 2013

Renate Lafer. "Zum Begriff gymnasium in den Inschriften der nordafrikanischen römischen Provinzen". In *Kultur(en) – Formen des Alltäglichen in der Antike. Festschrift für Ingomar Weiler zum 75. Geburtstag*. Ed. by P. Mauritsch and C. Ulf. Vol. 1. Graz: Leykam Verlag, 2013, 227–253.

Lindgren and Kovacs 1985

Henry C. Lindgren and Frank L. Kovacs. *Ancient Bronze Coins of Asia Minor and the Levant from the Lindgren Collection*. San Mateo: Chrysopylon, 1985.

Mango 2004

Elena Mango. "Bankette im hellenistischen Gymnasium". In *Das Hellenistische Gymnasium*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 273–311.

Marek 1993

Christian Marek. *Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia*. Tübingen: Wasmuth, 1993.

Marek 2003

Christian Marek. *Pontus et Bithynia. Die römischen Provinzen im Norden Kleinasien*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2003.

Marek 2006

Christian Marek. *Die Inschriften von Kaunos*. *Vestigia* 55. Munich: C. H. Beck, 2006.

Marek 2010

Christian Marek. *Geschichte Kleinasien in der Antike*. Munich: C. H. Beck, 2010.

Marrou 1965

Henri-Irénée Marrou. *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1965.

Meier 2012

Ludwig Meier. *Die Finanzierung öffentlicher Bauten in der hellenistischen Polis*. Hellenistische Polis als Lebensform 3. Mainz: Verlag der Antike, 2012.

Mellor 1975

Ronald Mellor. *ΘΕΑ ΡΩΜΗ. The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.

Mellor 1981

Ronald Mellor. "The Goddess Roma". In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Ed. by H. Temporini and W. Haase. 2.17.2. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1981, 950–1030.

Meyer 1987–1988

Eckhard Meyer. "Die Bronzeprägung von Laodikeia in Syrien 194–217". *Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte* 37.8 (1987–1988), 57–92.

Mitchell 1993

Stephen Mitchell. *The Celts in Anatolia and the Impact of Roman Rule*. Anatolia. Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor 1. Oxford: Clarendon Blood Pressure, 1993.

Moretti 1953

Luigi Moretti. *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche*. Rome: Signorelli, 1953.

Moretti 1954

Luigi Moretti. "KOINA ASIAS". *Rivista di Filologia* NS 32 (1954), 276–289.

Nigdelis 1995

M. Nigdelis Pantelis. "Oberpriester und Gymnasiarchen im Provinziallandtag Makedoniens: eine neue Ehreninschrift aus Beroia". *Klio* 77 (1995), 170–183.

- Nilsson 1955
Martin P. Nilsson. *Die hellenistische Schule*. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1955.
- Oehler 1912
J. Oehler. "s. v. Ὀλυμνιαρχος". In *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1912, 1969–2004.
- Pleket 2014
Henry W. Pleket. "On the Sociology of Ancient Sport". In *Sport in the Greek and Roman Worlds: Greek Athletic Identities and Roman Sports and Spectacle*. Ed. by T. F. Scanlon. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014, 29–81.
- Quass 1993
Friedemann Quass. *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1993.
- Radt 1999
Wolfgang Radt. *Pergamon. Geschichte und Bauten einer antiken Metropole*. Darmstadt: Primus Verlag, 1999.
- Reitzenstein 2011
Denise Reitzenstein. *Die lykischen Bundespriester: Repräsentation der kaiserzeitlichen Elite Lykiens*. Klio Beihefte 17. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2011.
- Remijsen 2015
Sofie Remijsen. *The End of Greek Athletics in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Rey-Coquais 1981
Jean-Paul Rey-Coquais. "Philadelphie de Coelésyrie". *Annual of the Department of Antiquities* 25 (1981), 25–31.
- Robert 1962
Louis Robert. "Monnaies dans les inscriptions grecques". *Revue numismatique* 4 (1962), 7–24.
- Robert 1967
Louis Robert. *Monnaies grecques. Types, légendes, magistrats monétaires et géographie*. Geneva and Paris: Droz, 1967.
- Rocci 1974
Lorenzo Rocci. *Vocabolario greco-italiano*. Milano et al.: Società Editrice Dante Alighieri, 1974.
- Şahin 2004
Sencer Şahin. *Die Inschriften von Perge*. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 54.1. Bonn: Habelt, 2004.
- Sartre 2004
Maurice Sartre. "Les manifestations du culte imperial dans les provinces syriennes et en Arabie". In *Rome et ses provinces. Genèse et diffusion d'une image du pouvoir*. Ed. by C. Evers and A. Tsingarida. Brussels: Le livre Timperman, 2004, 167–186.
- Sayar 2000
Mustafa H. Sayar. *Die Inschriften von Anabazos und Umgebung*. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 56. Bonn: Habelt, 2000.
- Schäfer 2000
Nadja Schäfer. *Die Einbeziehung der Provinzialen in den Reichsdienst in augusteischer Zeit*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2000.
- Scholz 2015
Peter Scholz. "Städtische Honoratioren herrschaft und Gymnasiarchie in der Kaiserzeit". In *Das kaiserzeitliche Gymnasium*. Ed. by P. Scholz and D. Wiegandt. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015, 79–96.
- Schröder, Schrader, and Kolbe 1904
B. Schröder, H. Schrader, and W. Kolbe. "Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon 1902–1903. Die Inschriften". *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung* 29 (1904), 152–178, Taf. XVI–XVII.
- Schuler 2004
Christof Schuler. "Die Gymnasiarchie in hellenistischer Zeit". In *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 163–192.
- Sherk 1992
Robert K. Sherk. "The Eponymous Officials of Greek Cities IV. The Register Part III: Thrace, Black Sea Area, Asia Minor (Continued)". *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 93 (1992), 223–272.
- Sherwin-White 1973
Adrian N. Sherwin-White. *The Roman Citizenship*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.
- Slater 1986
William J. Slater. *Aristophanis Byzantii fragmenta*. Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 6. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1986.
- Strubbe 1987
Johan Strubbe. "The Sitonia in the Cities of Asia Minor under the Principate". *Epigraphica Anatolica: Zeitschrift für Epigraphik und historische Geographie Anatoliens* 10 (1987), 45–82.
- Tzifopoulos 1998
Yannis Z. Tzifopoulos. "'Hemerodromoi' and Cretan 'Dromeis': Athletes or Military Personnel? The Case of the Cretan Philonides". *Nikephoros: Zeitschrift für Sport und Kultur im Altertum* 11 (1998), 137–170.
- Vitale 2012a
Marco Vitale. *Eparchie und Koinon in Kleinasien von der ausgehenden Republik bis ins 3. Jh. n. Chr.* Asia Minor Studien 67. Bonn: Habelt, 2012.
- Vitale 2012b
Marco Vitale. "Hellenische Poleis, Hellenarchen und koina der Hellenen fern der 'Heimat': Die Hellenen-Titulatur vom Schwarzmeer bis zur syrischen Wüstensteppe". *Tyche* 27 (2012), 153–192.
- Vitale 2013
Marco Vitale. *Koinon Syrias: Priester, Gymnasiarchen und Metropoleis der Eparchien im kaiserzeitlichen Syrien*. Klio Beihefte 20. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2013.
- Vitale 2014
Marco Vitale. "Gymnasiarch über wie viele 'Gymnasien', über welches Einzugsgebiet? Zum Kompetenzbereich von Gymnasiarchen in späthellenistischer und römischer Zeit". *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 188 (2014), 171–180.

Vitale 2016

Marco Vitale. “‘Priest’ – ‘Eparchy-arch’ – ‘Speaker of the ethnos’: Areas of Responsibility of Highest Officials of the Eastern Provincial Imperial Cult”. *Mnemosyne* 69 (2016), 82–111.

Weiler 2004

Ingomar Weiler. “Gymnastik und Agonistik im hellenistischen Gymnasium”. In *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*. Ed. by D. Kah and P. Scholz. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004, 25–46.

Williamson 2013

Christina G. Williamson. “Civic Producers in Stratonikeia”. In *Cities and Priests: Cult Personnel in Asia Minor and the Aegean Islands from the Hellenistic to the Imperial Period*. Ed. by M. Horster and A. Klöckner. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013, 209–245.

Wörle 2007

Matthias Wörle. “Zu Rang und Bedeutung von Gymnasium und Gymnasiarchie im hellenistischen Pergamon”. *Chiron* 37 (2007), 501–516.

Ziegler 1999

Ruprecht Ziegler. “Das Koinon der drei Eparchien Kilikien, Isaurien und Lykaonien im 2. und frühen 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr.” *Asia Minor Studien* 34 (1999), 137–153.

MARCO VITALE

is lecturer in Ancient History (epigraphy, numismatics) in Basel and Zurich. He obtained his PhD in 2010 with a book on the administration and city leagues of Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor (*Eparchie und Koinon*). He published a further monograph on ancient Syria (*Koinon Syrias*). His most recent book (habilitation thesis) on the textual and visual representations of subject peoples during Hellenistic, Imperial and Late Roman times appeared in 2017 (*Das Imperium in Wort und Bild*).

PD Dr. Marco Vitale
Universität Zürich
Historisches Seminar, Abteilung Alte Geschichte
Karl-Schmid-Strasse 4
8006 Zürich, Switzerland
E-Mail: marco.vitale@uzh.ch

ULRICH MANIA studied Classical Archaeology and History of Art at the University of Halle. His published dissertation deals with the sculpture and functional installations of the Red Hall in Pergamon. He was a team member of the excavations in Pergamon and Priene for many years, and Assistant Professor at the universities of Kiel and Bonn. After a three years as academic visitor at the University of Oxford he became research associate of the German Archaeological Institute Istanbul in May 2015.

MONIKA TRÜMPER is a Professor of Classical Archaeology at the Freie Universität Berlin and Spokesperson of the Berlin Graduate School of Ancient Studies for the FU. Her research focuses on Hellenistic and Roman architecture and urban studies, particularly domestic architecture, bathing culture, agorai/porticus, and commercial architecture. She did fieldwork in Delos and currently has excavation projects in Morgantina and Pompeii.

Within the BERLIN STUDIES OF THE ANCIENT WORLD series, monographs and volumes of all fields of ancient studies are published. These publications form the results of research conducted within the Excellence Cluster *Topoi. The Formation and Transformation of Space and Knowledge in Ancient Civilizations*, a research association between the Freie Universität Berlin and the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin as well as the partner institutions Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Max-Planck-Institut für Wissenschaftsgeschichte and Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz. The series is part of the research platform *Edition Topoi* and fully accessible at www.edition-topoi.org.

